Given

by the

Lincoln Christian College

Alumni Association

As Part

of a

$100,000 Gift,

1968-1971

WITHDRAWN
University of
Illinois Library
at Urbana-Champaign

GUARDIAN.—"Indispensable to all serious students of the history of the English Church."

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH

EDITED BY THE LATE

VERY REV. W. R. W. STEPHENS, D.D.

DEAN OF WINCHESTER

AND

THE REV. WILLIAM HUNT, Litt.D.

A Continuous History, based upon a careful Study of Original Authorities, and of the best Ancient and Modern Writers.

In Eight Volumes, with Maps, Crown 8vo.

Each vol. is sold separately, and will have its own Index.

Vol. I. **The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest (597-1066).** By the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. 7s. 6d. [*Ready.*

" II. **The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Close of the Thirteenth Century.** By THE VERY REV. THE LATE DEAN OF WINCHESTER. 7s. 6d. [*Ready.*

" III. **The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.** By the Rev. Canon CAPES, late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 7s. 6d. [*Ready.*

" IV. **The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary.** By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D. 7s. 6d. [*Ready.*

" V. **The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.** By the Rev. W. H. FRERE.

" VI. **The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne.** By the Rev. W. H. HUTTON, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. 7s. 6d. [*Ready.*

" VII. **The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.** By the Rev. Canon OVERTON, D.D., and the Rev. F. RELTON.

" VIII. **The English Church in the Nineteenth Century.** By F. W. CORNISH, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

A History of the English Church

Edited by the Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., F.S.A.,
late Dean of Winchester,
and the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A.

II

THE ENGLISH CHURCH

FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE ACCESSION OF EDWARD I

History of English Church—Vol. II.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH

FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST

TO THE

ACCESSION OF EDWARD I

(1066-1272)

BY

W. R. W. STEPHENS, B.D., F.S.A.

LATE DEAN OF WINCHESTER

London

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1904

All rights reserved

First Edition 1901
Reprinted 1904

TO THE MEMORY OF

TWO MOST DISTINGUISHED HISTORIANS

The Right Reverend William Stubbs

LATE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD

AND

The Reverend William Bright

LATE CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD, AND
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THAT UNIVERSITY

THIS INSTALMENT OF A WORK

WHICH WAS

HONOURED WITH THEIR INTEREST AND APPROBATION

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED BY THEIR

GRATEFUL FRIEND AND DISCIPLE

40442

INTRODUCTION

Interest in the history of the English Church has been steadily increasing of late years, since the great importance of the Church as a factor in the development of the national life and character from the earliest times has come to be more fully and clearly recognised. But side by side with this increase of interest in the history of our Church, the want has been felt of a more complete presentment of it than has hitherto been attempted. Certain portions, indeed, have been written with a fulness and accuracy that leave nothing to be desired; but many others have been dealt with, if at all, only in manuals and text-books which are generally dull by reason of excessive compression, or in sketches which, however brilliant and suggestive, are not histories. What seemed to be wanted was a continuous and adequate history in volumes of a moderate size and price, based upon a careful study of original authorities and the best ancient and modern writers. On the other hand, the mass of material which research has now placed at the disposal of the scholar seemed to render it improbable that any one would venture to undertake such a history single-handed, or that, if he did, he would live to complete it. The best way, therefore, of meeting the difficulty seemed to be a division of labour amongst several competent scholars, agreed in their general principles, each being responsible for a period to which he has

devoted special attention, and all working in correspondence through the medium of an editor or editors, whose business it should be to guard against errors, contradictions, overlapping, and repetition; but, consistency and continuity being so far secured, each writer should have as free a hand as possible. Such is the plan upon which the present history has been projected. It is proposed to carry it on far enough to include at least the Evangelical Movement in the eighteenth century. The whole work will consist of seven[1] *crown octavo books uniform in outward appearance, but necessarily varying somewhat in length and price. Each book can be bought separately, and will have its own index, together with any tables or maps that may be required.*

I am thankful to have secured as my co-editor a scholar who is eminently qualified by the remarkable extent and accuracy of his knowledge to render me assistance, without which, amidst the pressure of many other duties, I could scarcely have ventured upon a work of this magnitude.

W. R. W. STEPHENS.

THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER,
20th July 1899.

[1] *An eighth volume dealing with "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century" has since been added.*

According to present arrangements the work will be distributed amongst the following writers:—

I. The English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest, by the Rev. W. Hunt, D.Litt. *Ready.*

II. The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Close of the Thirteenth Century, by Dean Stephens, D.D. *Ready.*

III. The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. by the Rev. W. W. Capes, M.A., late Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. *Ready.*

IV. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII. to the Death of Mary, by James Gairdner, C.B., Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh. *Ready.*

V. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I., by the Rev. W. H. Frere, M.A. *In the Press.*

VI. The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne, by the Rev. William Holden Hutton, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. *Ready.*

VII. The English Church from the Death of Anne to the Close of the Eighteenth Century, by the Rev. Canon Overton, D.D., and the Rev. Frederic Relton. *In preparation.*

VIII. The English Church in the Nineteeth Century, by F. W. Cornish, M.A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. *In preparation.*

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

General Introduction: The Church and the Norman Conqueror, 1066-1070 1

CHAPTER II

The Early Years of Lanfranc 19

CHAPTER III

The Primacy of Lanfranc 43

CHAPTER IV

William Rufus and Ralph Flambard 64

CHAPTER V

Anselm and William Rufus 80

CHAPTER VI

Anselm and Henry I. 114

CHAPTER VII

PAGE

Rival Powers: the Church, the King, the Pope . . 132

CHAPTER VIII

Evil Times 144

CHAPTER IX

Henry II. and Thomas Becket 156

CHAPTER X

The Murder and After 176

CHAPTER XI

Weak Kings and Strong Prelates 198

CHAPTER XII

Resistance to Pope and King 221

CHAPTER XIII

The Church and the Patriots 234

CHAPTER XIV

The Monastic Orders 248

CHAPTER XV

PAGE
BISHOPS, CLERGY, FRIARS 274

CHAPTER XVI

POPULAR RELIGION, LEARNING, AND ART . . . 309

APPENDIX I

SOME PRINCIPAL EVENTS 333

APPENDIX II (TO CHAPTER IV)

TABLE SHOWING CHANGES MADE IN THE OCCUPANTS OF EPISCOPAL SEES IN THE REIGN OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR AND PART OF THE REIGN OF WILLIAM RUFUS . . 335

APPENDIX III

LIST OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS AND PRELATES, WITH DATES OF THEIR ACCESSION 336

APPENDIX IV

NOTE ON THE TAXATION OF THE CLERGY . . . 338

INDEX 341

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION: THE CHURCH AND THE NORMAN CONQUEROR, 1066-1070

THE Norman Conqueror brought the English Church and nation, which had hitherto been insulated in a kind of back-water, into the main stream of European civilisation just at the opening of one of the most eventful periods in the history of Christendom. The two hundred years that extend from the latter half of the eleventh century to near the close of the thirteenth were emphatically an age of growth—intellectual, religious, and political. It was an age of great men, of grand ideals and noble ventures. It witnessed the rise and progress of the Crusading movement until the enthusiasm which had inspired it was almost exhausted. It saw monasticism reach its zenith in the reform of the Benedictines, and the foundation of the Cistercian and Carthusian Orders. The Augustinian Canons Regular and the Cistercians spread rapidly over England in the course of the twelfth century; and not less rapid was the diffusion in the following century of the Mendicant Orders, especially the Franciscans. The latter not only brought the ministrations of Christian love and self-sacrifice to the outcast leper, the sick, the suffering, the needy, the sin-laden, but also furnished some of the leading teachers in the University of Oxford.

Introductory sketch of the period.

It was indeed an age of great intellectual activity, in which scholastic learning was carried to its highest stage of development, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge rose out of obscure beginnings into fame and importance. Amongst European scholars of the eleventh century Lanfranc had a

high reputation, especially for legal learning, while Anselm ranked as the foremost dialectician and theologian of his time. Amongst the scholars of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries few were more distinguished than John of Salisbury, Gilbert Foliot, and Edmund Rich; none more illustrious than Robert Grosseteste. Within the same period, also, two styles of architecture — the Norman and Early English — were successively brought to perfection, and the arts of illuminating, fresco-painting, and sculpture reached a high standard of excellence.

England was remarkably fortunate during these two centuries in the primates who occupied the metropolitan see of Canterbury. It would indeed be difficult to find any church which, within the same limits of time, could point to a succession of archbishops so eminent either for sanctity, or learning, or administrative ability, or all combined, as Lanfranc, Anselm, Theobald, Thomas Becket, Hubert Walter, Stephen Langton, Edmund Rich. And from time to time some of the other sees were filled with great prelates who, in various ways and degrees, as statesmen, or saints, or vigorous diocesan rulers, exercised an important influence on the life of the Church and nation. It was mainly through the action of the Church under the conduct of her great prelates that the kingdom was saved from total anarchy in the disastrous reign of Stephen, and that the liberties of both Church and nation were protected from the insolent tyranny of John, and the oppressive exactions of both the king and the pope in the reign of Henry III.

A succession of able and ambitious popes, beginning with Hildebrand (Gregory VII.), were striving, throughout this period, to give practical effect to the idea, a true and noble one in itself, that the spiritual power, being by nature superior to the earthly and temporal, ought to be paramount in Christendom. The conviction that the supreme spiritual authority centred in the papacy was based upon the belief, unquestioned for ages, that it was inherited by the popes from St. Peter, as the chief of the Apostles and the first Bishop of Rome. And the claim to a kind of suzerainty over the whole Church, especially in Western Europe, was strengthened by the belief that Constantine had conferred imperial sovereignty in the

West on Pope Sylvester, and that the administration of this empire in things secular had been afterwards bestowed by Pope Leo III. on Charles the Great. The attempt, however, to enforce this grand ideal of the supremacy of the spiritual power resulted before the close of our period in involving the papacy in the entanglements and intrigues of worldly policy. The papacy stooped to conquer, and was abased in the effort to exalt itself. The sword of the flesh, forbidden to St. Peter, was employed by those who called themselves his successors to compass ends supposed to be spiritual, while the spiritual weapons of anathema and excommunication were freely exercised to obtain or support temporal power.

The relation of the English Church to the papacy varied with the changing circumstances of the time, and with the characters of successive English sovereigns and Roman pontiffs. William I. and Lanfranc paid respectful deference to the apostolic see, but both king and primate plainly intimated that an absolute submission would not be yielded. Under William Rufus, Anselm appealed to the pope as the highest available source of justice against intolerable and brutal tyranny. In the strife of Anselm with Henry I. about "investitures," and of Thomas with Henry II. about "the customs," and the trial of criminous clerks, both prelates invoked the aid of the papacy against what seemed to them a tendency to despotic rule on the part of the crown. Innocent III. began by assisting the Church and nation against the tyranny of John, but, after the abject submission of the king to the Roman see, Innocent and his successors regarded England as a kind of feudal appendage over which they could exercise a variety of rights, especially that of demanding pecuniary aid to carry on their wars with the emperors. The long minority of Henry III. afforded a favourable opportunity for carrying the theory of papal suzerainty into practice, and Henry himself remained throughout his life a humble and submissive son, or rather servant, of the Holy See. The ever-increasing exactions of an extravagant king and avaricious popes drained the resources of the country, and exhausted the patience of the people until at last the clergy, baronage, and commons united their forces in resistance to the twofold oppression.

The sanction of the pope Alexander II. was no small assistance to William in his invasion of England. The Bull denouncing Harold as a usurper, and proclaiming William the lawful heir of the English throne, the ring presented to him containing a hair of St. Peter, the consecrated banner which floated over the centre of the victorious host at Senlac—all these things invested William's enterprise with the character of a holy war. He might have experienced some difficulty in collecting forces sufficient to warrant the venture had he not been able to appeal to religious sentiment as well as to a love of plunder, and the hope of rewards in the shape of English lands and lordships. Wealthy ecclesiastics in high position did not scruple to contribute men and ships for the invading army. Remigius, almoner of the abbey of Fécamp, supplied one ship with twenty knights, while the Abbot of St. Ouen furnished no less than twenty ships and one hundred knights, and Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, the duke's half-brother, one hundred ships. Although William declared on his death-bed that he owed his crown to the grace of God, and not to hereditary right, it is possible that he had sincerely believed in the justice of his claim, and this conviction was of course strengthened by the papal sanction. The verdict of heaven seemed to be in his favour.

Papal sanction of the Norman Conquest.

Moreover, although William would never surrender his independence to the pope he had always been a devout son of the Church. He was regular in his attendance at mass, a faithful husband in a profligate age, and a good father in taking care to have his children duly instructed in the Christian faith. He made his bishops and abbots in Normandy of the best men whom he could find, discountenancing the prevailing vice of simony, he promoted the building of churches and the reformation of monasteries, and presided over ecclesiastical councils in which canons were passed for the better government of the Church. Nowhere was the "Truce of God," by which hostilities were suspended during certain sacred seasons, more scrupulously observed than in his Norman duchy. On the eve of his departure for the invasion of England he appointed Lanfranc to be abbot of his new monastery of St. Stephen at Caen, and attended

William's devoutness.

the consecration of the yet unfinished church of the Abbey founded by his wife Matilda in the same town, when they solemnly dedicated their eldest daughter, then a child, as a sacred virgin to the service of God. When the invading host was assembled for embarkation at St. Valery he was a constant worshipper in the church, praying for a favourable wind; and when it came not, the wonder-working shrine of the saint was at his request carried forth in procession, and he knelt before it in the sight of his army. On the morning of the day when the decisive battle was to be fought he vowed that if God would grant him victory over the perjured Harold he would erect a great church to His honour on the brow of the hill where the royal standard of the English was set up. The banner consecrated by the pope waved over the duke himself and the group of distinguished warriors who surrounded him in the central division, which consisted of Normans only, and was the flower of the whole army. And when the battle had been fought and won the Conqueror permitted the bodies of the slain to be carried away by their friends for Christian burial, but he turned a deaf ear to the petition of Harold's mother that the corpse of her son might be taken to the minster of his own foundation at Waltham. Harold's weight in gold should be the price of his burial, and her prayer was seconded by two canons of Waltham who had followed the English army to see the issue of the battle. But William was inexorable; Christian burial might not be granted to the perjured usurper, and the body of Harold, wrapped in a purple robe, was buried under a heap of stones on the South Saxon shore.

Thus from the outset the Conqueror endeavoured to exhibit himself in the eyes of Europe as a champion of the Church, no less than as the rightful heir of the English throne. He had to justify the papal blessing on his enterprise by appearing in the character of a reformer who would bring the English Church into stricter conformity with Roman discipline and usage, more direct submission to the authority of the pope. In this work, however, he proceeded with deliberation and caution. Hasty and violent changes would have been resented by the people, and might have turned the hierarchy into centres of

His ecclesiastical policy.

disaffection and rebellion. A systematic substitution of Norman for English prelates was the policy at first adopted. For neither the Church nor the nation was prepared to yield a ready submission to the conqueror. The two archbishops, Stigand of Canterbury and Ealdred of York, supported the election of Eadgar the Ætheling, the grandson of Eadmund Ironside, at a gemot hastily held in London when the news of Harold's death arrived. Some of the bishops indeed opposed it, but they were probably the Normans and other foreigners who had been appointed in Eadward's reign. Meanwhile, the English army being overthrown, and Harold and his brothers slain, the whole country south of the Thames was defenceless. Dover, Canterbury, Winchester submitted to William without resistance, and having secured these three important positions —the strongest fortress, the ecclesiastical metropolis, and the ancient capital of England—he advanced upon London by a circuitous route, wasting the country as he went, and finally fixing his headquarters at Berkhampstead in Hertfordshire. Here he received an embassy from London to offer formal submission. The embassy, however, was not representative of London only. It included the Ætheling Eadgar,—a king deposed before he had been crowned; Ealdred, Archbishop of York; Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester; and Walter, Bishop of Hereford. It is not clear whether Archbishop Stigand also was one of the envoys, but as his submission must have been made before the coronation of William, at which he assisted, it was probably made on this occasion.

His coronation.

The Conqueror was crowned in Westminster Abbey on Christmas Day 1066. The canonical position of Stigand was unsound, for reasons which will be explained presently when his deposition has to be recorded. It would have been inconsistent with the character which William was anxious to assume of a pious son of the Church if he had sought consecration at the hands of the suspected primate; but, pending the decision of the Church, he would not subject the archbishop to indignity or insult. And so, as he walked through the abbey to the altar, the two archbishops walked one on either side of him, but the actual rite of coronation was performed by Ealdred of York. The solemnity of the ceremony was unhappily marred by tumult

and bloodshed. A mingled throng of English and Norman crowded the minster. The Archbishop of York and Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, asked the multitude in English and French whether they elected William and would consent to his coronation. A loud shout of assent arose from the representatives of both nations; it rang through the building, and was heard by the troop of Norman horsemen who were keeping guard round the church outside. Misinterpreting the noise, they imagined that some violence to the duke was being done or intended; but instead of hastening to his rescue, they set fire to some of the adjoining houses, either in revenge for the supposed insult, or to draw the people out of the church and so divert their attention from the duke. If this was their object they succeeded. The multitude, alarmed by the glare of the flames, rushed wildly out to save their goods; only the bishops and a few clergy and monks remained quaking before the altar with William, while even he himself, stout-hearted as he was, trembled vehemently as he took the oath to govern justly, and to defend the holy churches of God and their rulers. With trembling haste the archbishop poured the sacred oil upon his head and placed the sceptre in his hand. It was a sinister beginning of the conqueror's reign, and the first instance of the way in which his own desire and efforts to rule justly were often thwarted by the violence and insolence of his officials.

Since William professed to reign as the lawful successor of Eadward, all who had fought for Harold at Senlac, or afterwards resisted the authority of the Conqueror, whether clerics or laymen, were treated as rebels. Ælfwig, a brother of Earl Godwin, and Abbot of the New Minster at Winchester, had been killed in the battle of Senlac; Leofric, Abbot of Peterborough, had died of his wounds or from hardship a few days after it. The monks of the New Minster were punished by being kept without an abbot for three years; some of the estates of the house were divided amongst the king's followers, and a portion of their precincts was taken for the erection of his palace. The monks of Peterborough had elected one of their own body, named Brand, in the place of Leofric, and sent him for confirmation to Eadgar the Ætheling. William

His treatment of English monks and clergy.

was extremely wroth, and would have rejected the abbot, but as he was a good man, good men interceded for him, and he was allowed to make his peace by a present of forty gold marks. In fact, no English bishop or abbot was deposed or banished before the year 1070. On his first visit to Normandy in March 1067, William took Archbishop Stigand with him on the pretext of doing him special honour, but in reality, it is said, from fear that the primate might become an instigator of revolt in his absence. Æthelnoth, Abbot of Glastonbury, together with Eadwine and Morkere, the Northumbrian earls, were also compelled to accompany the king. All these unwilling companions were in fact hostages for the good behaviour of the newly conquered country. On all the churches in Normandy where prayers had been offered for the success of his enterprise, and on all the monastic houses in Burgundy, Aquitaine, and Auvergne which had contributed soldiers for the expedition, the king bestowed lavish gifts, ingots of gold and richly embroidered vestments, for in ornamental work of that kind England in common with other Teutonic countries excelled. To the pope he sent an astonishing amount of gold and silver, and costly ornaments, such as a Byzantine emperor might have envied. And some of his choicest gifts were of course reserved for the house of his own foundation, St. Stephen's at Caen, which he visited in person.

His gifts to churches.

Here he was greeted by Lanfranc, whom he had appointed abbot just before he set out for England. To him William was greatly indebted for the papal sanction which had facilitated the accomplishment of his daring enterprise, and perhaps some of the arguments by which he sought to justify it were suggested by the astute mind of Lanfranc, or at least put into shape by him.

Conference with Lanfranc.

The king and the abbot no doubt consulted deeply together concerning the administration of the newly conquered realm, and it seems highly probably that the deposition of Stigand and the elevation of Lanfranc to the archbishopric were arranged between them at this time. This surmise is strengthened by the fact that, a few months later, when Maurilius, Archbishop of Rouen, died, Lanfranc refused to accept the vacant primacy

to which he was elected by the unanimous voice of the Chapter and the whole people of Normandy. William, indeed, is said to have urged the office upon him, but he could hardly have ventured to do otherwise, considering Lanfranc's reputation and his own intimate relations with him. And as the Conqueror's will was absolute in appointments of this kind, there can be no question that had he been seriously determined in this instance, Lanfranc would have been compelled to give way. The natural explanation, therefore, is that he declined the office with the king's consent, because he was already marked out for a higher and more arduous post.

On his return to England in December 1067, William celebrated the Christmas festival at Westminster, where he afterwards held a council at which he is expressly said to have treated the bishops with the greatest courtesy and suavity, admitting them to the royal kiss, granting their petitions, and lending a ready ear to their information and suggestions. The populace in London received him with outward signs of loyalty and good-will, and although there was much discontent beneath the surface, a strong party of order had been formed, at the head of which stood Ealdred, Archbishop of York, and several other bishops.

Council at Westminster 1067.

In this midwinter council at Westminster the first opportunity occurred of acting on the policy which had no doubt been pre-arranged by William and Lanfranc, of gradually filling up the bishoprics and abbeys in England with Norman prelates. Wulfwig, Bishop of the vast central diocese which stretched from the Thames to the Humber, had died at Winchester during William's visit to Normandy, and was buried at Dorchester in Oxfordshire, which was then the episcopal see. The vacancy was now filled up by the appointment of Remigius the almoner of Fécamp, who had earned the gratitude of William by contributing a ship with twenty knights to the army of invasion. It is a noteworthy fact that Remigius was consecrated by Archbishop Stigand. On a later occasion indeed he declared that he had sought consecration from Stigand, as the existing metropolitan, not being fully aware of his uncanonical position. But he can hardly have been

Remigius made Bishop of Dorchester, 1067.

ignorant that doubts were entertained concerning it, that William himself had not been crowned by him, and that even Harold and several English bishops, including his own predecessor, Wulfwig, had avoided consecration at his hands. As William, however, did not raise objection to the consecration of Remigius by the primate, we may conclude that it took place with his permission, perhaps by his direction. If so we have here a proof of his caution. He did not wish to betray his intention towards Stigand until he could make sure of his action being supported by the weight of papal authority. The point of immediate practical importance for William was that the vacant see of Dorchester should be filled with a Norman.

Bishop Leofric of Exeter and Gisa of Wells.

After the reduction of the West country, which was completed by the fall of Exeter in 1068, the Church in Normandy was enriched by grants out of the conquered territory, more especially the metropolitan see of Rouen, and the monastic houses founded by William and Matilda at Caen, while one lordship in Somerset was bestowed upon the church of St. Peter's at Rome. The churches of St. Germans and Bodmin in Cornwall were deprived of many of their lands to swell the vast possessions of the king's brother, Robert, Earl of Mortain. Leofric, Bishop of Exeter, and Gisa, Bishop of Wells, were not disturbed in their sees. But Gisa was a Lotharingian by birth, and Leofric was a Lotharingian by education and training. Both of them had re-modelled their chapters of secular canons on the Lotharingian pattern by introducing the rule of Chrodegang of Metz, which imposed a kind of monastic discipline on the canons, requiring the use of a common refectory and a common dormitory. Such a reform would find favour with William and Lanfranc, who regarded monasticism as the highest type of religious life.

Archbishop Ealdred and the sheriff.

Gloucestershire and Worcestershire seem to have been subdued about the same time. They were placed under the rule of a most oppressive sheriff, Urse of Abetot, who laid violent hands with impartial rapacity on the property of laymen and clerics. He built a castle at Worcester close to the monastery of St. Mary's, and grievously annoyed the monks by his depredations. They

complained to Ealdred, Archbishop of York, who investigated their grievances on the spot, and rebuked the sheriff to his face, invoking a malediction upon him in a vigorous bit of English verse:—

"Hightest thou Urse,
Have thou God's curse."

William of Malmesbury relates that the bishop added, "and my own curse and that of all hallowed heads unless thou takest thy cattle from hence, and know of a surety that thy offspring shall not long enjoy their heritage of St. Mary's land;" —a prediction which, the Chronicler says, was fulfilled in his son, Roger, who was banished by King Henry I., because he had dared, in a fit of passion, to have one of the royal officials put to death. Whatever truth there may be in the details of this story it illustrates the sufferings to which the people were liable at the hands of insolent Norman officials, and the way in which a courageous English prelate could stand between the oppressor and the oppressed. The part which native clergy in high position had to play must have been extremely difficult. Many of them probably recognised in the success of William, and the sanction of his enterprise by the pope, the verdict of heaven in his favour, and were prepared to submit to him as their lawful sovereign. Many more must have perceived the hopelessness of resistance, and must have desired for the sake of peace that the people would quietly bow to a yoke which they could not shake off. On the other hand, it must have been impossible not to sympathise, and difficult to refrain from joining, with the people when they were goaded to revolt by the rapacity or cruelty of the Conqueror's agents.

When the great insurrection broke out in Northumbria in 1068 the clergy and monks offered daily prayers for its success. The primate Ealdred endeavoured, but in vain, to restrain the movement. When William paid his first visit to York on his way to quell the revolt, Æthelwine, Bishop of Durham, came and made submission, and arranged terms of peace between the Conqueror and Malcolm, King of Scots. But Durham itself had not submitted, and the inhabitants were presently provoked to outrage by the folly and violence of Robert of Comines,

Æthelwine, Bishop of Durham.

whom William made Earl of Northumberland. When the earl marched northwards to take possession of his territory the bishop, knowing the temper of the people, met him near Durham, and entreated him not to attempt to enter the city. Robert, however, persisted, and was lodged without opposition in the bishop's house, where he was treated with all due respect. But his followers took upon themselves to treat the city like a place captured by storm; the citizens were pillaged and some of them slain. Next morning, aided by a force from outside, the people turned furiously upon their oppressors, and a general massacre of the Normans took place. The earl and his retinue offered a stubborn resistance at the bishop's house, but at last the insurgents set fire to it. The house was burned, and the earl and all his companions, save one, perished either in the fire or by the sword. The flames nearly caught the western towers of the Minster, but were diverted by a change of wind, in answer, as it was believed, to the prayers of the people.

In the winter of 1069-1070, when William took a terrible vengeance for a second revolt of the Northumbrians, by laying waste the country, Bishop Æthelwine and the canons sought safety for themselves and the relics of their patron, Saint Cuthbert, in flight to his holy isle of Lindisfarne; and on his arrival at Durham the king found the city deserted, except by the aged, infirm, and sick, who had sought shelter in the Minster, where many perished miserably of cold, hunger, and disease. It was the depth of winter and the cold was intense, but the king did not desist from the work of devastation until he had subdued the whole of Northumbria by turning it into a wilderness. Then he moved southwards. The last place which made a stand was Chester, and the country round was ravaged wirh merciless severity before the city yielded. The fugitive inhabitants made their way in crowds to the Abbey of Evesham where Æthelwig, the abbot, supplied them with food and shelter, but the abbey buildings could not contain them all. Many lay in the streets and churchyard, many were too weak and ill to take the food offered to them; many died day after day, and were buried by the pious care of the Prior Ælfric.

With the fall of Chester the subjugation of all England

was complete. The work had been done with such thoroughness that no further attempts at resistance on a large scale were possible. The merciless destruction of life and property is indeed a sickening story, yet one great crushing blow perhaps inflicts less misery than the protracted and wearing struggles of a half-conquered people. And although William was a hard man, callous to human suffering and unscrupulous in the sacrifice of human life when it seemed necessary for securing his ends, he was not wantonly cruel. He was a stern, but on the whole, a just master; robbery, wrong, and violence did not easily escape punishment in his reign; he endeavoured to rule not as a foreign despot but as an English king, in accordance with the ancient laws of the realm. And although for the reduction of rebellion, or even for the creation of a hunting-ground he did not hesitate to destroy churches, yet he was not unmindful of his coronation oath "that he would defend the churches of God, and the rulers thereof, that he would govern with righteousness and prudence, that he would ordain and keep right law, and utterly prohibit plunder and unjust judgments."

England subjugated.

As soon as the country had been thoroughly subdued, he turned his attention to the establishment of good order in Church as well as State.

It was his custom to keep the three great festivals of the Church in three different places—Christmas at Gloucester, Easter at Winchester, and Whitsuntide at Westminster. On these occasions he wore his crown in solemn state and took counsel with the great men, the "witan" of the realm,—archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, thegns, and knights. The first of these great councils after the reduction of the country was held at the Easter Festival at Winchester in 1070. At this council three papal legates appeared,—Ermenfrid, Bishop of Sitten, with the cardinal priests, John and Peter. They placed the crown on William's head, thus publicly confirming his position with the seal of papal approbation. They were honoured, it is said, by him as if they had been angels of God, and aided him in many places and many affairs with their authority and advice. Their arrival is significant of the closer relation which was to exist henceforth between the papacy and the English Church,

Council at Winchester, 1070.

and it marks the beginning of the process by which native bishops and abbots were systematically supplanted by foreigners, for the most part, of course, Normans.

The metropolitan see of York was already vacant by the death of Ealdred; the see of Canterbury was now to be made void by the deposition of Stigand. Up to this time William had dissembled his intention towards the primate; for although Stigand had not been selected to pour the consecrating oil on the Conqueror's head at his coronation, yet he had been permitted to take some part in the ceremony, and to consecrate Remigius of Dorchester, the only bishop whom William had appointed since his accession; and when the king took Stigand to Normandy he had treated him with marked honour and respect. But he was now formally tried before the legates and condemned on three grounds. (i.) He held the see of Winchester together with the archbishopric; (ii.) he had seized the archbishopric during the lifetime of Robert of Jumièges, and in celebrating mass had used the pall which Archbishop Robert had left behind him; (iii.) he had obtained his own pall from the usurping Pope Benedict X. Stigand's defence, whatever it may have been, of which we have no record, was deemed insufficient. He was deprived of both his bishoprics and kept under some kind of restraint at Winchester for the remainder of his life. The most probable out of many stories appears to be that he was confined to the precincts of the royal castle, with full permission to procure such food and clothing as became his station. He persisted, however, in leading a very ascetic life, and when his friends, more especially the "old lady," Lady Eadgith, the widow of King Eadward, entreated him to indulge himself in more comforts, he was wont to declare on oath that he had not a penny to spend. After his death, however, a large hoard was found buried in the ground, and a key which was suspended from the bishop's neck opened a writing case which contained an exact description of the quality and weight of the coin. Whatever truth there may be in these stories, William of Malmesbury, and all the Chroniclers who follow him, agree in stating that he had been an avaricious man, who had bought his own preferment, and had enriched himself by the sale of

Deposition of Archbishop Stigand.

high offices in the Church, and by keeping some of the wealthiest monastic houses in his own hands. Amongst other costly treasures of the deposed primate, discovered after his death, was a large silver cross, together with two images (probably the blessed Virgin and St. John), which the king presented to the Cathedral Church of Winchester, where they were erected on the top of the rood-screen between the choir and nave.

The fall of Stigand involved that of his brother Æthelmær, for whom he had procured the bishopric of the East Angles. No reason is recorded for his deposition, but probably he was found guilty of a simoniacal transaction. Æthelric, a former Bishop of Durham who had given up his see and retired into the seclusion of the monastery at Peterborough, was now seized and imprisoned at Westminster: his offence is not stated, but as his brother Æthelwine, who had succeeded him at Durham, was outlawed at the same time, we are led to suppose that they were suspected of some treasonable designs. There is one offence however, on the part of Æthelwine which is recorded. It will be remembered that he and his chapter had fled from Durham to Lindisfarne on the approach of William with his army. They left the great crucifix of the Church behind them, partly because it was too ponderous to be easily carried away, and partly because they hoped that the sight of the cross would inspire the invaders with feelings of reverence for the church. The Norman soldiers, however, threw it down and despoiled it of the ornaments with which it had been adorned by Earl Tostig and his wife Judith. The king expressed great indignation at this act of sacrilege, and when he had discovered the perpetrators of it, he sent them to the bishop and canons at Lindisfarne to receive due punishment. They, however, were either intimidated or bribed into inaction, and the offenders escaped without suffering excommunication or any other penalty. In the following Lent the bishop and canons returned to Durham, solemly "reconciled" the desecrated minster, and restored the body of St. Cuthbert's to its resting-place. Then at the Easter council at Winchester 1070, the sentence of outlawry was passed on the bishop. It would suit William's policy well to punish an English bishop

Æthelwine Bishop of Durham outlawed.

for lack of zeal in defending his own church; but he may also have suspected him of disaffection, a suspicion which subsequent events confirmed. Æthelwine sought safety in flight. He sailed for Germany, taking some of the treasures of his church with him: but his ship was driven back by stress of weather, and the bishop retreated into Scotland, where he remained to the following year, 1071, when we find him taking part in the insurrection which had Hereward for its leader, and the isle of Ely for its centre. After the capture of Ely and the suppression of the revolt he was imprisoned in the Abbey of Abingdon, but after a time he was committed to the care of Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, where he died in the following year 1072.

Another prelate who sought safety in flight after the council at Winchester was Æthelsige, Abbot of Ramsey and of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. The double office had been conferred upon him by Eadward the Confessor, and hitherto he had enjoyed the confidence of William, who had even employed him as the envoy to the court of Swend, King of Denmark, to whom his abbot now fled for protection. William forthwith appointed a Norman, named Scotland, to the vacant post at St. Augustine's. The monks resented the intrusion of a foreigner, but dared not resist. Scotland, however, justified his appointment by adding to the buildings of the monastery and recovering many of the estates which had been forcibly seized by the Normans, or surrendered to them through fear. Some years afterwards Æthelsige was taken back into favour and reinstated as Abbot of Ramsey.

Flight of Abbot Æthelsige.

The severe sentences passed upon so many prelates in the council at Winchester struck the whole assembly with terror, for no man knew whether he might not be himself the next victim. Nevertheless there was one English bishop who dared to assert the rights of his see in the face of the king. Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, was distinguished for the most guileless simplicity of character and saintliness of life, but he had also that intrepid courage which naturally accompanies honesty of purpose and single-minded devotion to duty. Ealdred, the late Archbishop of York, on his translation from the bishopric of Worcester, had deprived

Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester.

that see of some of its estates. After his death these lands had passed, during the vacancy of the see of York, into the hands of the king, and Wulfstan now demanded their restitution. It was part of the king's policy to redress abuses and irregularities in the Church, and Wulfstan's claim was patiently heard; but the king and the legate prudently declined to judge the question until a new archbishop should be appointed and both sides could be heard. As yet the Church of York was dumb, being without a shepherd to speak for her.

The appointments to the vacant sees were deferred until the Whitsuntide council, which was held this year at Windsor. The see of York was then bestowed on Thomas, the treasurer of the Church of Bayeux and a chaplain[1] of the king—a man of high reputation for integrity and learning, having studied in Germany and Spain. Winchester, vacant by the deprivation of Stigand, was given to Walkelin, who is said to have been a kinsman, as well as a chaplain, of the king. The council had been held on Whitsunday, and on the following day Ermenfrid, the papal legate, held a synod in which several abbots were deposed, and also Æthelric, the bishop of the South Saxon see of Selsey. The nature of his offence is not stated, and Florence of Worcester says that his deprivation was uncanonical; but perhaps his consecration by Stigand was considered a sufficient ground for a sentence. His place was filled by another Stigand, also a royal chaplain, and yet another chaplain was promoted to the East Anglian see of Elmham, vacant by the deprivation of Æthelmær, brother of the deposed primate. Walkelin was consecrated by the legate Ermenfrid; but the consecration of Thomas to York was deferred until he could receive it at the hands of the Primate of Canterbury, who had yet to be appointed.

Council at Windsor.

No one who knew the Conqueror's mind could doubt that for this high office his friend and counsellor Lanfranc, the Abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen, was destined; and he was now formally nominated for it by the king with the unanimous approval of the whole assembly, which consisted, according to Florence of Worcester, of the senior members of the Church of Canterbury, bishops,

Lanfranc elected Abp. of Canterbury.

[1] It must be remembered that the king's chaplains were clerks of the royal treasury. See vol. i. p. 395, and J. R. Green's *Conquest of England*, p. 544.

nobles, clergy, and people. Ermenfrid the legate, and another legate named Hubert, who now appears for the first time, were sent to convey to Lanfranc the news of his election, and to obtain his consent to it. They summoned a great meeting of bishops, abbots, and nobles of the duchy, and urged Lanfranc, by virtue of his obedience to the apostolic see, to accept the office to which he had been called. He was in all probability well aware that William had destined him for the post, but he was reluctant to accept it. He pleaded his insufficiency for so weighty a charge, and in particular his ignorance of the English language and of the barbarous inhabitants of the island. To exchange the calm and studious retirement of the cloister which he loved for the harassing labours and anxieties of episcopacy in a strange land, was indeed a plunge from which he might well shrink ; and although the Queen Matilda and her son Robert added their entreaties to those of the assembly, he only yielded at last to Herluin, Abbot of Bec, who had been his spiritual father, and who enjoined him, as one that had a right to be obeyed, not to resist the call of duty.

AUTHORITIES.—For the life of William the Conqueror, *Ordericus Vitalis*, ed. Migne ; William of Poitiers to end of 1067, ed. Giles ; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum ; The Saxon Chronicle ;* Henry of Huntingdon, William of Newburgh (all in Rolls series) ; Florence of Worcester, ed. Hist. Society. For affairs in the North, Simeon of Durham (Rolls series). For lives of Archbishops Stigand and Ealdred, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum ; Annals of Winchester ;* Simeon of Durham ; Roger of Hoveden (all in Rolls series) ; *Fasti Eboracenses*, ed. Raine ; E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Norman Conquest*, vols. iii. and iv.

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY YEARS OF LANFRANC

LANFRANC landed in England on the August 15, 1070, and on the 29th of the same month, the feast of the decollation of St. John the Baptist, he was consecrated in the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury by the Bishop of London, assisted by eight other bishops. It is significant that only one of these, Siward of Rochester, was of English birth. William, Bishop of London, was a Norman, who had been appointed by King Eadward, and enjoyed the respect of Normans and English alike; and, after the expulsion of the Normans in 1052, his popularity had regained him his see. Walkelin of Winchester, Remigius of Dorchester, Herfast of Elmham, and Stigand of Selsey, were all Normans; Gisa of Wells, Walter of Hereford,[1] and Herman of Sherborne were Lotharingians. Four bishops, including the English Wulfstan of Worcester, were absent, but they all signified their assent to the appointment of Lanfranc, and explained the reasons of their absence by messengers or letters. The greater part of the Cathedral at Canterbury had been destroyed by fire about three years before, and although it had been patched up for the services of the monks, the ceremony of consecration must have been deprived of much of its dignity by the ruinous condition of the building, but any lack of splendour was compensated by the hearty welcome given to the archbishop-elect. He had been met on his way to Canterbury and honourably conducted into the city not only by the whole body of monks from the

Lanfranc consecrated Abp. of Canterbury.

[1] Florence of Worcester is the only chronicler who mentions Walter of Hereford as one of the assistant bishops.

metropolitan church, but also by the brethren from the rival house of St. Augustine, with their new Abbot Scotland at their head.

In truth the English Church might feel honoured by receiving for its head such a man as Lanfranc, renowned throughout Christendom as the most learned and brilliant scholar of his time; and if he was not strictly a saint, the purity of his life and sincerity of his devotion had never been questioned. He was a native of Pavia, born about 1005, the son of a lawyer who held some municipal office in the city. The Lombard cities, although absorbed into the Roman Empire, maintained a large amount of independence; they were practically self-governing communities, and the old civil law of Rome survived as at least the groundwork of their internal administration. The study of jurisprudence was an important part of a good education, and Lanfranc made great proficiency in this branch of learning. By one writer indeed (Robertus de Monte) he is credited with having shared with Irnerius the discovery of the Roman law books, and this story, although chronologically impossible, is an evidence of the high reputation which he had aquired for legal learning. In the law courts he is said to have proved himself more than a match for the most experienced advocate in eloquence and forensic skill.

Early life of Lanfranc.

What induced him to throw up the prospect of a successful and lucrative profession at Pavia, and seek a new career in France, can only be conjectured. There seems, however, to have been a great demand for learned men at this epoch north of the Alps, and a more promising opening for them than in Italy. The progress of science and civilisation had been checked in Italy since the ninth century by the petty wars between local rulers, the exhausting invasions of the German Emperor in the north, and the harassing attacks of the Saracens in the south. Some reformation of the Church had been effected in the latter part of the tenth century, when learning and piety ascended the papal throne in the person of Gerbert as Sylvester II.; but during the first forty years of the eleventh century, when the popes became the nominees, generally the simoniacal nominees, of the Counts of Tusculum, it had sunk back into the depths

of degradation and corruption. In France, on the other hand, the intellectual movement which had begun in the days of the Emperor Charles the Great, although impeded in the tenth century by internal strifes and barbarian incursions, had now received a fresh impulse. The reformation of monastic life originating at Cluny and Avrille, where Gerbert had been trained, was spreading in all directions. Many old schools of learning in connection with monastic houses were resuscitated, and new ones were created. There were schools at Lyons, at Toul, at Metz, at Verdun, at Chartres, at Reims, at Cambrai, to which students flocked from all parts of Christendom.

His arrival in Normandy

It was probably about the year 1039 that Lanfranc (being then thirty-four or thirty-five years of age) took his journey into France accompanied by a few young men of noble family, his pupils perhaps in the study of law. He made for Normandy under the persuasion that it afforded the most promising opening to fame and wealth. There had been great lack of learning and culture there since the settlement of the Northmen. But wherever the Normans conquered and settled they exhibited a wonderful capacity for adopting the language, the arts, and the religion of the people whom they subdued. They lost none of their own vigour, and imparted some of it to the people with whom they mingled. So it was in that part of France to which they gave their name. So it was at a later date in Sicily and in England. None became more loyal sons of the Church than the descendants of the heathen Rollo, none more enthusiastic crusaders, none more active in founding churches and monastic houses, or more bountiful in bestowing gifts upon them. In the first half of the eleventh century a kind of passion for the foundation of churches and monasteries animated the leading men in Normandy. "Every nobleman," says Orderic Vitalis, "deemed himself contemptible if he did not support clergy or monks on his property." "All noblemen," says William of Jumieges, "vied with one another in building churches on their estates, and enriching the monks who offered prayers to God on their behalf." The shrewd and sagacious mind of Lanfranc may have discerned in the Normans the coming people of the age,—strong, receptive, capable of unlimited development; and not long after his arrival in Normandy the wonderful courage and

skill with which the young Duke William crushed rebellion and made himself master of his land and his people marked him out as destined for a great career.

His school at Avranches.

On his arrival in Normandy Lanfranc took up his abode at Avranches, and either taught in some existing school or established one for himself. In days when copies of books were necessarily rare and costly the professor who had mastered certain branches of learning was to students what a standard book is to us: the authority which every one quoted, and to which every one had recourse. If he conveyed his knowledge in clear and eloquent language his lecture room was crowded, and he became the object of enthusiastic veneration.

So it was with Lanfranc. In two years he had acquired a great reputation, and scholars flocked to him from all parts of Europe, many of them from Italy. The principal subjects that he taught were probably dialectic, rhetoric, and theology. The study of the Roman civil law could not have been much needed in Normandy, where disputes would be settled in accordance with customary law not derived from Roman sources. Nevertheless, Roman law had probably a place amongst the subjects taught by Lanfranc, for the great canonist Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, was his pupil.

His removal to Bec.

Devout study of the New Testament led him to form a momentous resolution. He conceived that the only way to obey the command of Christ, "if any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me," was utterly to renounce the world and devote himself to prayer, meditation, and study in some solitary retreat. So he set out one day with a single companion, Paul (afterwards Abbot of St. Alban's), not knowing whither he went. They were overtaken by night in the forest of Ouche, and fell into the hands of robbers, who after stripping him of such things as he had with him, left him bound to a tree with his hands behind his back and his cloak tilted over his face. In the silence of the night he lifted up his soul to God and tried to say the office of lauds, but found to his dismay that he could not remember it. In the midst of his avocations as a student and teacher, he had not found leisure before to go through the office. Horrified at the discovery of

his ignorance, he now renewed his vow that if he escaped from his present peril he would dedicate himself wholly to God's service. At dawn his cries for help attracted the notice of some wayfarers, who released him. He begged them to show him the way to the humblest monastery in the neighbourhood, and they directed him to a house which they said a man of God was then building at Bec. The man of God was Herluin. As a vassal of Gilbert, Count of Brionne, he had been distinguished for courage and skill in arms. At the age of thirty-seven he narrowly escaped capture or death in a battle in which his lord was defeated, and he resolved henceforth to devote himself to the service of God. He withdrew entirely from the little court of Count Gilbert, and having spent much time in prayer and meditation he determined, about the year 1034, to plant a monastery on his own little estate of Burneville. His means were small, but he laboured with his own hands in digging the foundations, carrying the building materials, and erecting the walls. He could find no one willing to be head of so poor a house, so he was ordained priest and became his own abbot. At the end of five years he was compelled to shift his little monastery owing to dearth of water, and built a new house and church at the confluence of the river Risle and a brook, whence the spot received the name of Bec. At the age of forty he had begun to learn how to read, and after spending his days in manual toil he would devote his evenings to study. The men who joined monastic brotherhoods in those rude days were often coarse, passionate, ignorant,—a curious mixture of simple childlike piety and barbaric violence. He felt himself unequal to the task of training and educating such wild undisciplined natures. He often prayed that God would send him a man who would aid him in the government of his house; and Lanfranc was the answer to that prayer.

Origin of the house at Bec.

Herluin was engaged in building an oven when Lanfranc presented himself and signified his wish to become a monk. The book of the rule was sent for; Lanfranc declared his willingness to submit to it; the scholar and professor put on the monk's frock, and made his humble profession of obedience to the simple-minded, unlearned soldier who presided over the house.

Arrival of Lanfranc.

Each could admire and respect the good qualities of the other, and a warm and lasting friendship sprang up between them. Lanfranc was a perfect pattern of submission to monastic discipline. On one occasion when it fell to his lot to read to the brethren in the refectory during dinner, the prior, who was an illiterate man, corrected him for making the penultimate syllable in "docēre" long. Lanfranc repeated the word as the prior directed it to be pronounced, with the wrong quantity, considering, as his biographer observes, that obedience was better than prosody. Although Lanfranc devoted the greater part of his time to study, the abbot found his knowledge of law and secular business of much value in administering the affairs of the monastery. He was in fact a thoroughly practical man, who did not neglect the smallest details of household management. But the conduct of some of the brethren: their coarseness, and indolence, and negligence of the rules, so disgusted him, that he seriously thought of retreating to a hermitage; and with this view he began to train himself for the life of a recluse by feeding on roots and berries. At the earnest entreaty, however, of his abbot he abandoned this intention, and soon afterwards Herluin made him prior. His appointment to this office was the turning-point in the history of Bec. It was the origin of a school which became renowned throughout Europe. With Lanfranc science entered the monastery, and together with science, piety and strict discipline. Two schools were connected with the house, one for children dedicated to the monastic life, another for those who were intended to become secular clerks, or who were not destined for any clerical office. Pupils soon flocked to this school from Flanders, Brittany, Gascony, and all parts of France. The crowd outgrew the buildings: the situation of the house was not healthy, and it was removed to a new site, but the cost of the new buildings was easily covered by liberal offerings of land and money. The dream of Herluin was fulfilled, in which he had seen a fountain of water spring out at the bottom of the valley, which rose until it overflowed the hills and flooded the surrounding plains.

He is made prior.

From the days of Lanfranc for more than a century and

a half, the great house of Bec poured forth learned, able, and pious men, who rose to the highest places in the Church: one pope, Alexander II.; two archbishops of Canterbury, Anselm and Theobald; William Bonne Ame, Archbishop of Rouen; Ivo, Bishop of Chartres; Ernost and Gundulf, Bishops of Rochester; Fulle, Bishop of Beauvais; Richard and Geoffrey, Bishops of Evreux; Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster, the biographer of Herluin; Paul, Abbot of St. Alban's, the nephew or, as some said, the son of Lanfranc. The fame of Bec.

Lanfranc began his work as prior about 1045, and carried it on for about twenty years, which were probably the happiest of his life. Many churches tried to get him for abbot or bishop; the Pope, Nicholas II., tried to entice him to Rome, and sent two of the emperor's chaplains and two of his own to be instructed by him, but he could not be induced to leave Bec. His work there was thoroughly congenial to him. In addition to teaching, he spent much time in correcting texts of manuscripts, revising the work of his copyists, and collecting books for the library.[1]

An incident which threatened to bring his happy life at Bec to an abrupt conclusion, turned out to be only the beginning of a new career of greatness. Lanfranc had his enemies. Some of the coarse and ignorant clergy in Normandy, on the estates belonging to the monastery, resented the higher standard of living and learning which he endeavoured to introduce. And his unpopularity was increased by his sarcastic wit. His adversaries succeeded in prejudicing the mind of Duke William against him. William had married Matilda, daughter of Baldwin, Count of Flanders, regardless of the fact that she was within the forbidden degrees of marriage, and equally regardless of the censures which the Church pronounced upon the union. The interdict laid upon the whole duchy by the pope was unheeded. William was A crisis.

[1] In the library of Alençon is a manuscript copy of the *Collations of Cassian*, written on 142 parchment leaves, folio size, in a hand of the eleventh or early twelfth century, and at the top of the last page in the same hand as the rest of the work, are the words, "Huc usque correxi." Above them in somewhat paler ink and in a different hand, is the name "Lanfrancus." Up to the seventeenth century the book was in the library of the Benedictines of Saint Martin at Seez.

informed that the Prior of Bec had publicly denounced the marriage. The duke commanded him to quit Normandy, and ordered the home-farm of the monastery to be destroyed by fire.

Amidst the lamentations of the brethren Lanfranc departed from his beloved home. He rode upon a lame horse, the only one that the monastery could furnish, accompanied by a single attendant. On his way, passing near the court of William, he met the duke himself, who asked him whither he was going. "I am going out of the province, in accordance with your order," replied Lanfranc, in a cheerful tone, "and if you will kindly give me a better horse, I will obey your command more speedily." The bold, good-humoured answer made a favourable impression on the duke. They entered into friendly conversation, and the result was a complete reconciliation on the basis of a mutual agreement. Lanfranc undertook to plead the cause of William at the Papal Court, and William promised on his side to restore the prior to his office, and to make good the damaged property of the house. William and Lanfranc were astute men, and no doubt in the interview each took the measure of the other's character. Lanfranc could see in the duke a man of inflexible will, whom it would be unwise to provoke and useless to resist. William could discern in the subtle and learned Italian a valuable counsellor in the administration of affairs, civil as well as ecclesiastical.

Meeting of Lanfranc and William.

The return of Lanfranc to Bec was welcomed with the ringing of bells and singing of "Te Deum." Soon afterwards he took his journey to Rome, and fulfilled his promise by pleading the cause of the duke. The pope, Leo IX., had to choose between a dangerous adversary or a powerful ally. And he knew from his experience of the Normans in Apulia and Sicily, Robert Wiscard, and Richard his brother-in-law, what manner of men Normans were. He knew that beneath a semblance of respect for his office and regard for religious observances, there was concealed a resolute spirit which would not brook being thwarted or controlled, and that his wisest course was to make the best terms he could with them. Lanfranc could represent to the pope that Duke William was a man cast in the same

Lanfranc reinstated.

mould as the sons of Tancred of Hauteville, and that he was the most powerful prince in the north of Europe, ruling a compact and well-ordered territory. He may, perhaps, even have hinted at his possible claim some day to the throne of England. At any rate, the pope learned that he would be ill advised to quarrel with such a potentate. On the other hand, it would accord well with the dignity and pretensions of the Roman see to grant a dispensation in the case of so mighty a personage, only prescribing the terms on which it should be given. The papal sanction, therefore, was given to the union of William and Matilda, on condition that they founded two monasteries in Normandy. Such was the issue of Lanfranc's mission. He earned the gratitude alike of William and of the pope. He became from that moment the intimate friend and counsellor of the duke, who henceforth did nothing of importance without consulting him.

Lanfranc at Rome.

The condition on which the pope gave his sanction to William's marriage was faithfully fulfilled. Two convents were founded at Caen, one by Matilda, for women; the other by William, for men, which was dedicated to the first martyr, St. Stephen. In June 1066, the Prior of Bec became the first abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen. He took with him a novice named Raoul, who became in time the first abbot of "St. Martin's, on the place of battle," the great house which William founded to commemorate his victory over Harold. At Bec, Lanfranc was succeeded in the office of prior by Anselm, and the school of learning which he had created there was carried on by one greater than himself.

Abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen.

The removal of English prelates and the substitution of Normans, begun by William, and carried on still more systematically after Lanfranc became archbishop, must not be attributed entirely to political motives. There can be no doubt that the English clergy and monks were, at this epoch, as a body, far behind those of Normandy and the continent generally in learning and cultivation if not in morals. At the close of the tenth century there may have been little difference between the standards attained in the two countries, but in the eleventh century, and especially

Condition of English clergy.

during the forty years that preceded the Conquest, while Normandy had advanced under the influence of the school of Bec and the strong rule of the dukes, England had remained stationary, or rather had gone back. The revival of learning and religion which originated with Dunstan and his disciples in the tenth century, had received a severe shock during the Danish invasion in the miserable reign of Æthelred the Unready. Brighter days, indeed, had returned after the Danish conquest, under the wise and just rule of Cnut, but amidst the distractions of Eadward the Confessor's feeble reign there had been another relapse. All contemporary writers represent the condition of the English Church at the time of the Norman conquest as one of degradation. The clergy were illiterate and ignorant, the discipline of the monastic houses was extremely lax; the monks differed little from laymen in their dress, and were addicted to sport and all manner of secular pursuits. Simony was prevalent. Synods, frequently held in Normandy, were very rare in England. The council held at Rome in 1050 by Leo IX. was the last continental council that had been attended by any representative from England.

The aim of William was to bring the English Church up to the same level as that of the Church in his own duchy. "He wished," says Eadmer, "to maintain in England the same usages and laws that he and his forefathers had been accustomed to observe in Normandy." In ecclesiastical appointments he pursued the same methods in both countries. When an abbot died, it was his custom to send prudent agents to the bereaved house to make a careful inventory of the goods, less they should be wasted by unscrupulous guardians. Then he assembled bishops, abbots, and other wise counsellors, and with their aid he diligently sought out the ablest man that could be found to rule the house alike in things secular and sacred. He abhorred simony, and in appointing bishops and abbots, the qualifications to which he paid most regard were not wealth or power, but wisdom and holiness. And when he had appointed the best men that he could find to high offices in the Church, he expected from them a zealous discharge of their duty, and demanded implicit obedience to his laws.

William's ecclesiastical policy.

The efforts of William to elevate the condition of the Church were ably seconded, and no doubt in great measure prompted, by Lanfranc. The king and the primate were joint rulers of the Church. No emperor and pope had ever worked together in such perfect concord; and it was a common saying that two such men as William and his archbishop were not to be found in any country. If William was supreme head, Lanfranc was determined that he himself should hold the foremost place next to the king.

Harmony between king and primate.

For this purpose it was necessary in the first place that the subordination of York to Canterbury should be clearly established. If the Church was to be reformed and brought up to the continental standard throughout the whole kingdom, it was essential that there should be one ecclesiastical head. But the subjection of York to Canterbury was not less important from a political point of view. It was in the north of England that William had encountered the most serious resistance. It was the most likely region to become the centre of disaffection or rebellion, and to support the claim of some rival pretender to the throne; and if the Archbishop of York was an independent metropolitan, he might be tempted into giving some ecclesiastical sanction to an invader, or even crowning him as the sovereign of an independent kingdom. But an Archbishop of York, who had professed canonical obedience to the see of Canterbury, could not venture on such an act without involving himself in ecclesiastical as well as civil rebellion. It was necessary, therefore, to insist on the full submission of the new Primate of York to the new Primate of Canterbury; and it was doubtless with this design that, while the other newly-appointed bishops were consecrated by the legate Ermenfrid, Thomas, elect of York, was reserved for consecration at the hands of Lanfranc.

York to be subject to Canterbury.

So when Thomas came to Canterbury, and all things were ready for the ceremony of consecration in the Cathedral, Lanfranc demanded a profession of obedience. Thomas refused to make it, not however, it was said, from arrogance, but from ignorance of the customs of the realm, and from being misled by the language

Thomas of York refuses obedience.

of flatterers. Neither prelate would give way. Lanfranc, therefore, bade the assisting bishops take off their robes; the assembly was dissolved, and Thomas went away unconsecrated. He appealed to the king. At first the king was indignant with Lanfranc, thinking that he had exceeded his legitimate rights, but in the course of a few days the primate had an audience with the king, and pleaded his own cause. The Normans who heard him were convinced by his arguments, and the English, who knew the ancient laws of the realm, bore testimony to the justice of his claim.

The king, however, proceeded with caution. He required Thomas to return to Canterbury and make a profession of personal obedience to Lanfranc, but he was not to be bound to renew the profession to any of Lanfranc's successors, unless the supremacy of Canterbury should be declared in the meantime by a competent tribunal. To this compromise Thomas with some reluctance assented; he came back to Canterbury, made the required profession, and returned to his province a consecrated bishop.

A compromise.

Soon after this event, Lanfranc required and received profession of obedience from those bishops who had been consecrated by Stigand, or by other archbishops, or by the pope himself. Remigius of Dorchester, the first Norman appointed by William to an English bishopric, now made the singular statement that he had gone for consecration to Stigand as the existing metropolitan, not being wholly ignorant, nor yet fully aware of his uncanonical position.

In the following year the two archbishops repaired to Rome to receive their palls, and were accompanied by Remigius. The Pope Alexander II. treated Lanfranc with peculiar honour, rising to meet him, contrary to the usual custom. He explained, however, that this honour was paid to Lanfranc not as archbishop, but as his former master at Bec, at whose feet he had sat as a humble learner. Lanfranc in his turn humbly prostrated himself before the pope, who raised him up and embraced him. Two palls were presented to him, one which was taken off the altar, the customary badge of archiepiscopal rank; the other as a mark of personal friendship, being one

The archbishops visit Rome.

which the pope was in the habit of wearing when he celebrated mass.

The next day, when business of various kinds was being transacted, it was represented to the pope that both Thomas and Remigius were disqualified for the office of bishop, the former because he was the son of a priest, the latter because he had made gifts to King William when he was about to invade England, for which he had been rewarded with the bishopric of Dorchester, and was thus involved in a simoniacal transaction. The accused bishops surrendered their rings and staves to the pope, and cast themselves upon his mercy. Lanfranc interceded for them, pleading that they were both of them men of learning and eloquence, acceptable and even necessary to the king in the work of reorganising his kingdom. The pope, thereupon, gave the rings and staves into Lanfranc's hands, to be disposed of in the way that he might deem most conducive to the welfare of the Church over which he presided, and Lanfranc straightway reinvested the bishops with them. The account of the incident reads as if the whole scene had been preconcerted between the pope and Lanfranc. The pope's credit was saved by a display of courageous zeal for ecclesiastical discipline, in threatening to cancel the acts of such a powerful and loyal son of the Church as William, while by prudently abstaining from the execution of his threat in deference to the mediation of Lanfranc, he retained the favour of the king, and placed him and his archbishop under a certain degree of obligation to himself.

A singular scene.

A more remarkable concession to the independent spirit of the English Church was the decision of the pope, that the question as to the respective rights of the two metropolitan sees should be heard and determined in a national council of bishops and abbots. The question was discussed in the first instance in 1072, at the great Easter council, held according to custom at Winchester in the royal castle. This council of course included laymen of high rank; but the final decision was given at a synod of ecclesiastics held at Windsor at Whitsuntide in the same year. The king presided at the Winchester council, and adjured all present by virtue of their oaths of fealty to devote their

An English national synod.

earnest attention to the question, and to give an impartial judgment.

The cause was argued at great length, evidence being produced from Bede, and a long series of papal letters[1] to prove that from the days of Augustine the Archbishops of Canterbury had exercised metropolitan jurisdiction over the whole Church in Britain; that they had held ordinations and councils at York, and that Archbishops of York had been summoned to councils in Canterbury. The final decision was entirely in favour of Canterbury. Archbishop Thomas had also contended that the three sees of Worcester, Lichfield, and Dorchester belonged to his jurisdiction, but this claim was rejected, and the Humber was fixed as the boundary of the two provinces. In councils, Canterbury was to preside, York to sit on his right hand, London on his left, Winchester was to sit next to York, and the other bishops in the order of their consecration. The Archbishop of York might receive profession of obedience from the Bishop of Durham, and from the Scottish bishops when it could be obtained. The see of Carlisle was not yet in existence.

Supremacy of Canterbury confirmed.

Thus the supremacy of Canterbury was distinctly established, the profession of obedience was to be made not merely to Lanfranc personally, but to him and his successors. A letter from Archbishop Thomas to Lanfranc, written soon after this decision, is couched in terms of obsequious humility: "To the most pious and reverend Archbishop of Canterbury, chief pastor of all Britain Lanfranc, Thomas his faithful servant and, if it do not seem presumptuous to his holiness, Archbishop of York. Behold most reverend father thy son crieth unto thee, or rather the daughter Church of York; and repairing to that Church over which thou presidest, as to a maternal bosom, dutifully makes request," etc. The request was that Lanfranc would permit two of his suffragans to assist Thomas in consecrating a

Archbp. Thomas submits.

[1] Ten letters were produced, purporting to be addressed by successive popes to English kings or prelates from the beginning of the seventh century to the latter part of the tenth. They are given in *William of Malmesbury*, vol. i. pp. 47-61, but in reference to the question at issue, they have clearly received interpolation. Some are based on letters in Bede, with additions of manifestly later date; others ascribe supremacy to Canterbury in terms which could not have been used when the dispute had not arisen.

bishop for the Orkneys, and he is solemnly assured that compliance with this request will not lead to any renewal of the claim that Thomas had recently made to jurisdiction south of the Humber. Lanfranc addressed a letter to the Bishops of Worcester and Lichfield—Wulfstan and Peter—directing them to repair to York without delay, and forwarding to them at the same time the letter of Archbishop Thomas to relieve them from any doubts that they might entertain as to his good faith.

In his own diocese Lanfranc was concerned with the threefold task of rebuilding the cathedral church, reforming the monastery, which was in a very disorganised condition, and recovering certain lands and liberties which the church had lost through the cupidity and violence of Odo, Earl of Kent, half-brother of the king. Lanfranc swept away the remains of the ruined church and substituted a minster of the regular Norman type, a great cross church with an apse at the east end and two towers at the west end. The nave was supported by eight arches on either side, and there was an ascent by steps from the nave to the choir, which was under the central tower. Immediately west of the choir was a great *pulpitum* or rood loft. The ceilings were adorned with frescoes, and the richest gold-embroidered vestments were provided for the clergy. The whole fabric was completed in seven years, and men knew not which most to admire,—the beauty of the structure or the rapidity with which it had been erected.

Lanfranc rebuilds his Cathedral.

Outside the north gate at Canterbury he built a goodly hospital of stone for the sick poor, and surrounded it with a spacious court. The hospital was constructed in two divisions, one for men and one for women. The inmates were provided with food and clothing, and a staff of servants was appointed to attend to their wants and see that the rules of the hospital were observed. On the opposite side of the way he built a church in honour of Pope Gregory the Great, which was served by a body of regular canons, whom he amply endowed with land and tithes. Their duties were to minister to the spiritual wants of the sick folk in the hospital and to bury the dead.

His hospital at Canterbury.

Outside the west gate, on the slope of the hill, he erected

some wooden houses for lepers of both sexes (the two being kept strictly separate), with a church, also served by canons and other officials, on whose skill, kindness, and patience he could rely to minister to the spiritual and bodily needs of the sufferers.

His private liberality was large; clergy or monks rarely appealed in vain to him for help, and generally received more than they asked. Often his bounty was bestowed without having been asked for, and in the most secret manner, in obedience to the rule of his divine Master.

With generosity in almsgiving Lanfranc combined a scrupulous care for the property of his see. One memorable instance of his recovery of certain lands and privileges connected with them, which had been usurped by Odo, Earl of Kent, is recorded by all the Chroniclers of the time, and furnishes an interesting example of judicial procedure in the age of the Conqueror. The king ordered that the case should be tried according to ancient English forms before the Scirgemot of Kent, and that Englishmen known to be well versed in the laws of the country should be summoned to give evidence. The assembly was convened on Penenden Heath, the customary place of the gemot. The regular presidents would have been the primate and the earl, but as they were the litigants, Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, acted in that capacity. The assembly was composed of English and Normans, and the pleadings occupied three days. Æthelric, the deposed Bishop of Selsey, was summoned as an expert in the ancient laws of England. He was a very aged man, and was conveyed from his place of confinement at Marlborough, by the king's express command, in a waggon drawn by four horses. The proofs adduced by him and other witnesses of the claims of Canterbury to the property and the rights of which it had been despoiled, are said to have been so clear and convincing, and were ratified by the gemot in such positive terms, that no one henceforth dared to question the decision.

Trial on Penenden Heath.

Not only was the property of the see recovered from usurping occupants, but the archbishop succeeded in limiting the king's rights over the archiepiscopal lands, and establishing certain rights of his own over the lands of the king and

the earl. The king could make a highway through the church lands, could punish crimes committed upon it, and could claim any tree that fell upon it. The primate, on the other hand, was to have the right of punishing crimes attended with bloodshed during the season of Lent, and the whole of the penalty called "childwite," paid by the father of the illegitimate offspring of a female villein, was to go to the archbishop during Lent, and half of it at least at all other times. The decision of the gemot was submitted to the king, who approved and confirmed it with the consent, it is said, of all his chief men. The whole transaction from first to last illustrates William's anxiety to rule as an English sovereign, not as a despotic foreign conqueror.

Rights of king and archbishop defined.

The death of Siward, the English Bishop of Rochester, in 1075, gave Lanfranc an opportunity of introducing the same kind of reform there that he had already effected at Canterbury. A Norman, of course, was appointed to fill the vacant see. Ernost had been successively a canon of Rouen, a monk at Bec, and at St. Stephen's, Caen, after Lanfranc was made abbot. He died, however, within a year after his consecration at Rochester, and was succeeded by Gundulf, who had also been trained in the house of Bec. The cathedral was in a ruinous condition, and was served by four canons, who were reduced to such poverty that they had to support themselves by begging alms. Gundulf lost no time in rebuilding the church, and the four canons gave way to a body of monks who, under the fostering care of Lanfranc and Gundulf, grew to the number of fifty. He was distinguished for his architectural ability, and was selected by the Conqueror to superintend the erection of the mighty Tower of London. He also built a fortress at Malling, and the royal castle at Rochester in the reign of William Rufus.

Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester.

The condition of the northern metropolis was very similar to that of Canterbury, and the same process had to be gone through of restoring the cathedral and reconstituting the chapter. Archbishop Thomas found the cathedral a blackened ruin, and out of the seven canons by whom the Church had been served only three remained after the ruthless devastation of the country with

Thomas, Archbp. of York.

which the Conqueror had put down the revolt in Northumbria. The archbishop repaired the church, recalled the scattered canons, and increased their number. He did not supplant them by monks, but endeavoured, like Gisa at Wells and Leofric at Exeter, to introduce the rule of Chrodegang of Metz, building for this purpose a refectory and dormitory, and placing the canons under the rule of a provost. The experiment, however, was not more successful than in any of the other English cathedrals, and after a time Archbishop Thomas was wise enough to abandon it. He divided the estates of the church into prebends, allotting one to each canon or prebendary for his maintenance, and he founded the dignities of dean, precentor, and treasurer. The office of chancellor, who was master of the schools, he had previously instituted when he introduced the Lotharingian rule.

Walkelin, Bp. of Winchester.

At Winchester, Bishop Walkelin began in 1079 the building of a mighty minster, which still abides unchanged in all its severe and solemn grandeur in the transepts and the crypt, and survives also in the main substance of the massy piers that support the nave. Walkelin was no less remarkable as the leader of a party opposed to the popular sentiment of the time, which set strongly in favour of monasticism. While Lanfranc and some of his suffragans were busy removing secular canons for monks, Walkelin and some other prelates would have displaced monks for secular canons. They probably thought, and with good reason, that a body of secular clergy would be more manageable than monks, who were always aiming at exemption from episcopal authority, and in many instances were not adhering strictly to the rule of their Order. Walkelin and his party also maintained that many of the duties which devolved upon a chapter, especially in the metropolitan cathedral of Canterbury, were inappropriate to monks, and could be more efficiently discharged by secular clergy, who had more experience of men and affairs. If they could succeed in introducing seculars into two such important cathedrals as Canterbury and Winchester, they flattered themselves that the change would easily be effected elsewhere. Their hopes were raised still higher when they found the king favourable to their view. On the continent the cathedrals were generally served by secular canons, and Walkelin

probably thought it would be desirable to model the English cathedrals on the same pattern. So confident, indeed, was he of carrying out his design at Winchester that he had forty canons, robed in their vestments, ready to occupy the stalls as soon as the monks were ejected. He had not obtained the consent of Lanfranc, but he seems to have assumed that what the king approved the primate would not oppose. He found himself much mistaken. A general substitution of canons for monks would have been nothing less than a revolution in the English Church, undoing the work of St. Dunstan and St. Æthelwold, who were held in special honour. Moreover, not only was Lanfranc himself a monk, but monasticism was the backbone of the reform which Hildebrand was at this time endeavouring to effect in the Church at large. The monks were his militia; and in popular estimation also monasticism ranked as the highest attainable form of Christian life. Lanfranc not only forbade the proposed change at Winchester, but, fearing that it might be effected at Canterbury after his death, he obtained a Bull from Pope Alexander II. denouncing it as a diabolical invention, and absolutely prohibiting it. Accordingly the canons whom Walkelin had brought together at Winchester had to retire discomfited, and the monks remained undisturbed until the general overthrow of the monastic orders in the sixteenth century. The action of Lanfranc greatly strengthened his popularity; it was regarded as a token that the grace of the national saint, the holy Dunstan, had been abundantly shed upon him.

Leofric, Bishop of Exeter, died in 1072. He was succeeded by Osbern, a Norman, the son of a man who had been William's faithful guardian in his early years. He had come over to England in the reign of Eadward the Confessor, and had so thoroughly adopted English tastes and habits that, unlike all the other Norman bishops, he was content to leave his cathedral and the buildings connected with it unaltered. The massive Norman towers which are such conspicuous features in the existing cathedral were erected by Bishop Warelwast in the reign of Henry I.

Osbern, Bishop of Exeter.

The Lotharingian Bishop of Hereford, Walter, who died in

1079, was succeeded by Robert Losinga, another Lotharingian, who was distinguished for scientific learning, especially in astronomy. He followed the prevalent fashion of rebuilding his cathedral, in which he is said to have imitated the style of the Basilica at Aachen, but not the faintest resemblance to that church is traceable in the Norman work of the cathedral as we see it now.

Robert, Bishop of Hereford.

Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, was the only bishop of English birth who now remained in possession of his see. He was universally respected for his holiness and the faithful discharge of his duty, and, although he was not a learned man, the learned Bishop of Hereford became his devoted friend. We have seen with what boldness in the council at Winchester in 1070 he maintained his rights to the estates of which his see had been deprived by Ealdred, Archbishop of York. The claim of Thomas, the first Norman Archbishop of York, to jurisdiction over the see of Worcester had been disallowed in 1072;[1] yet he entertained the most friendly feelings towards Wulfstan and invoked his assistance in administering some parts of the Northumbrian diocese which he himself shrank from visiting, partly from ignorance of English, partly from fear of the hostile disposition of the natives. Lanfranc also, although he is said to have been inclined at first to look down upon Wulfstan as an illiterate man, did not disdain to employ him in visiting some of the central districts of England, which were only half subdued, and unsafe for a Norman prelate to approach.

St. Wulfstan, Bp. of Worcester.

In later times Wulfstan became the subject of a striking legend illustrative of that honest fearlessness and straightforwardness which won universal admiration and respect. The king and the primate, so the story runs, had resolved to depose him like the other English bishops, inasmuch as he could be of no use in the royal counsels owing to his lack of learning and his ignorance of the French language. He was summoned to appear before the king and his council, who were sitting in Westminster Abbey in front of the tomb of Eadward the Confessor. When the summons came Wulfstan was engaged in singing the office of nones. Some of his friends suggested that he would be better

Legend concerning him.

[1] See above, pp. 31, 32.

occupied in considering what defence he should make before the king, to which he replied: "Ye are foolish, and know not how the Lord said, 'when ye stand before kings and princes take no heed to meditate how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in the same hour what ye ought to speak.'" The story goes on to relate that when Wulfstan, being brought before the king and his council in Westminster Abbey, was required to surrender his episcopal staff and ring, he arose, staff in hand, acknowledged his unworthiness, and said he would willingly resign his staff, but not to William, seeing that he had not received it from him. He would restore it to the holy Eadward who had bestowed it upon him. Thereupon he advanced to the tomb of the sainted king and addressed his deceased master, beseeching him to remember that it was only in deference to his wishes that his servant had unwillingly accepted the burthen of the episcopal office, although chosen by the monks at the petition of the people, and with the consent of the bishops and nobles. Now there was a new king, a new primate, new laws, and he was charged with error and presumption who had only obeyed his master: but he would not resign his charge to any one save him who had first bestowed it on him. Having thus spoken, he laid his staff upon the tomb, saying "Take it, my lord and king, and give it to whomsoever thou wilt." Then he retired and sat him down apart from the bishops as a simple monk amongst the monks. Lanfranc bade his chaplain Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, take up the staff from the tomb, but the solid marble had opened, and closed tightly upon it, and refused to let it go. The primate himself, and even the king, tried to detach it, but they tried in vain. The significance of the miracle could not be mistaken. It was clearly the will of St. Eadward that the holy bishop should not be deprived of what he had given him. William and Lanfranc begged his forgiveness; he was confirmed in the possession of his see, and the estates which Ealdred had taken from it were finally restored. Then, at the prayer of Wulfstan, the marble of the tomb relaxed its clutch on the staff, and surrendered it once more into the hand of its lawful owner.

Whatever foundation of truth there may be in this story, it supplies valuable evidence that both before and after the

Norman conquest the will of the king was the determining power in the appointment of bishops. After making all allowance for legendary embellishments, there can be no doubt that Wulfstan was a man of apostolic zeal, and if he had not great learning he had good sense and practical ability. Under his administration the number of monks attached to the cathedral at Worcester was increased and the revenues were enlarged. He followed the fashion of the Norman bishops in removing the church of his predecessor, St. Oswald, and erecting another of grander proportions in its place, of which the crypt—a structure of remarkable lightness and beauty—has survived to the present day unaltered. When the new church was finished, and the demolition of the old one was begun, Wulfstan was observed to weep, and when his companions remonstrated with him for not rejoicing at the completion of so noble a work, he replied that their forefathers had been content with less stately buildings, because to them every place was a church in which they could offer themselves as a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto God. "We, on the contrary," he continued, "are diligent in p'ling up buildings made of stone, but are too negligent of those living temples which are the souls of men."

His character and works.

He himself was emphatically a preacher of righteousness. He laboured with patient zeal to put down an infamous traffic in slaves which prevailed at Bristol. For this purpose he repeatedly visited the town, sojourning there sometimes as long as three months, and preaching earnestly every Sunday, until at last his efforts were crowned with success, and Bristol became, in its purity from the vice of slave-trading, a pattern to other English ports.

Æthelric, the deposed Bishop of Durham, was succeeded in 1071 by Walcher, a Lotharingian. He was consecrated at Winchester by Thomas, Archbishop of York. Eadgyth, the widow of Eadward the Confessor, who witnessed the ceremony, was reminded by his ruddy countenance, his tall stature, and his white hair, of the deceased king, and is said to have exclaimed, "Here we have a goodly martyr." The tragic end of the bishop was held to be the fulfilment of her prediction. Personally he was a good man, and monasticism, which had been extinct in Northumbria

Walcher, Bp. of Durham.

since the Danish invasions, revived under his administration. The abbeys of Jarrow, Wearmouth, and Whitby arose from their ruins, and the foundation was laid of a house at York which afterwards became the Abbey of St. Mary without the walls. Walcher is said to have intended to remove the canons from his cathedral church in favour of monks, and if his duty had been confined to episcopal work he would probably have carried this and other measures of reform into effect. But unfortunately, after the execution of Waltheof, Earl of Northumberland, on suspicion of treason in 1076, the custody of the earldom was committed to the bishop; and the government of such a turbulent region demanded qualities in which he was entirely deficient. He confided the principal management of affairs to a relation named Gilbert. Gilbert and other agents murdered, out of jealousy, an English thegn, Liulf, who was held in great esteem by the bishop and all people for his piety and uprightness. The bishop, however, did not punish the murderers or cease to employ them. The people therefore demanded a general gemot, which was held at Gateshead. The bishop and his creatures, who dared not face it, occupied the church and parleyed with the assembly outside through messengers, until the patience of the people was exhausted and a cry arose: "Short rede, good rede, slay ye the bishop."

Thereupon a massacre began of persons in the crowd who were supposed to be friendly to the bishop. One by one his agents came out of the church, and at last the bishop himself, in the hope of appeasing the multitude, but it was too late; they were all hacked to pieces. The mangled body of Walcher was rescued by the monks of Jarrow and carried to Durham, where it was buried in the chapter house. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, was sent to punish the inhabitants of the earldom for this outrage, which he did with merciless severity. As his own personal spoil he carried away a pastoral staff of costly material and rare workmanship.

Murder of Walcher, 1080.

AUTHORITIES.—*Opera Lanfranci*, ed. by Giles, together with the *Vita Lanfranci* by Milo Crispin; Eadmer's *Hist. Nov.*; William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pont.*, Gervase of Canterbury (Rolls series). Lanfranc, *Sa vie, son enseignment, sa politique*, by J. de Crozal, a very good modern monograph.

Also Charma, *Notice Biographique;* Freeman, *Norm. Conq.* vols. iii. and iv.; Bp. Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* vol. i. pp. 281-288, 347; Hook, *Lives of Archbishops*, vol. ii. For the trial on Penenden Heath, *Anglia Sacra*, vol. i. p. 334. For the dispute with Archbishop Thomas from the York side, T. Stubbs and Hugh the Chanter, ap. *Historians of York* (Rolls series). For the life of Wulfstan, *Anglia Sacra*, vol. i. p. 541 and vol. ii. p. 241, and notices in *Flor. of Worcester.*

CHAPTER III

THE PRIMACY OF LANFRANC

English abbots having less political influence than the bishops were not so systematically deposed in favour of Normans: nevertheless on one pretext or another a considerable number were removed. Lanfranc and William generally appointed men of proved ability and high character to take their place. The condition of many of the houses was, as we have seen, very unsatisfactory, and it was necessary to put them under strong rulers. The administration of a foreigner who was also a reformer must often have been very distasteful, and in some instances where new customs and discipline were forced upon the monks without tact or consideration a sharp contest ensued. Such was the case at the great Abbey of Glastonbury. On the deposition of the Abbot Æthelnoth, Thurstan, a monk from St. Stephen's at Caen was appointed. The monks received him respectfully, and promised a loyal obedience if he would deal gently with them. Thurstan, on the contrary, dealt harshly with them, insisting on arbitrary alterations in the services, especially, it is said, on a new method of chanting invented by a certain William of Fécamp. The brethren offered a stubborn resistance to these innovations. Thurstan one day called his bodyguard of Norman archers into the chapter house to frighten or coerce the offenders. The monks fled hither and thither: some of them sought refuge in the church, fastening the doors behind them, and clustering round the altar, but the archers burst in, ascended to the triforium, and thence shot upon the crowd below. Three monks were slain and eighteen wounded, their blood streamed down from the

English abbots deposed.

Revolt at Glastonbury.

altar steps to the floor of the choir: the holy rood itself was pierced with arrows.

The sequel illustrates the care which the Conqueror took to do justice. The monks appealed to him, and their cause was heard and tried before him. Thurstan was deprived of his office and sent back to Caen in disgrace. But the monks were not entirely absolved from blame; the majority were dismissed and placed under the charge of various bishops and abbots to be detained in some kind of confinement. The subsequent conduct of Thurstan proved him to be an unscrupulous as well as violent man, for after the death of the Conqueror he obtained restoration to his office from William Rufus by the influence of some of his relations, and the yet more potent aid of a bribe of five hundred pounds of silver.

The great Abbey of St. Albans fared better than Glastonbury. The office of abbot fell vacant in 1072, whether by the death or deposition of the English abbot Fritheric is uncertain; and Lanfranc appointed his nephew Paul, to whom he was very much attached. Some persons indeed maintained that Paul was a son of the primate, nor is it impossible that Lanfranc may have been married before he became a monk. Paul, like Thurstan, was brought from St. Stephen's house at Caen. He proved himself to be a very capable, as well as munificent prelate. He reformed the discipline, and improved the revenues of his house, and erected that vast and stern fabric upon which we still gaze with admiration and awe, notwithstanding the cruel disfigurements of the modern restorer. The bricks of Roman Verulam supplied the principal material for the building, and Lanfranc himself contributed 1000 marks to the work. St. Alban's, we are told, was his favourite abbey, and he aimed at making it a model house, like Bec, or St. Stephen's at Caen.

Paul, Abbot of St. Albans.

Although Paul was not cruel or insolent to the living monks, he treated the dead with indignity, demolishing the tombs of his English predecessors, many of whom were held in great veneration on account of their piety or high rank. Paul pronounced them to be ignorant barbarians, unworthy of respect; but notwithstanding this spiteful treatment of the honoured dead, he does not seem to have been on bad terms with his English neighbours. Ligulf, a wealthy Thane, and

his wife presented two bells for the new minster, Ligulf was rich in flocks of sheep and goats, some of which he sold to buy his bell for the church, and when he heard it ringing from the minster tower he would say merrily in his English tongue, "Hark! how sweetly bleat my sheep and goats!" and when his wife, who gave the other bell, heard the sweet concert of the two, she rejoiced in the sound as symbolical of the loving union between herself and her husband.

The king naturally took special care to place an abbot over Westminster Abbey worthy of so important a position. On the death of Abbot Geoffrey in 1077, we are told that William deliberated anxiously and long about the choice of a successor. Finally, on the recommendation of Lanfranc and other leading men he selected Vital, a monk of Fécamp and Abbot of Bernay, a monastery founded by the Conqueror's grandmother Judith.

Vital, Abbot of Westminster.

The political importance of placing the monasteries under the rule of strong men of Norman birth, was proved by the events that occurred at Peterborough and Ely. On the death of Brand in 1070 the office of abbot at Peterborough was bestowed on Turold, a monk of Fécamp, whom William had placed over the Abbey of Malmesbury. He was now translated to Peterborough. The abbey was threatened by Hereward the leader of the last English revolt, which had its centre in the fen country. Turold had the reputation of being a very stern and determined man. He came at the head of an armed force to take possession of his abbey; but it had been already seized by Hereward and his followers, who had plundered it of all its choicest treasures; the golden ornaments of the great rood, the gold and silver pastoral staff which was hidden in the steeple, crucifixes, books, vestments, vessels, precious things of all kinds. The inmates had all dispersed, and when Turold arrived he found a desolate house and a despoiled church. One sick monk had been left behind in the infirmary. The other brethren, however, soon returned, and in the course of a week the services were resumed: but the treasures of the Church were lost for ever. Some Danes who had assisted Hereward put them on board their ships and sailed away for their own country. Pursued, as it was thought,

Events at Peterboro'.

by the vengeance of heaven for their sacrilege, they were driven hither and thither by tempests, some to the coast of Ireland, others to Norway. A church in Denmark in which the spoils of Peterborough were finally deposited was burnt soon afterwards with all its contents.

The Abbot of Ely and his monks sympathised with the insurrection under Hereward. The leading insurgents were honoured guests in the refectory; monks and armed men sat there side by side while the weapons of war were suspended on the walls. The revolt was finally crushed by William himself, who invested the isle of Ely and captured it in 1071. Abbot Thurstan and his monks succeeded in making their peace with the king by a very heavy fine, which they had to raise by despoiling the church of many of its choicest ornaments. Thurstan died in 1076. The Norman abbots who succeeded him gradually recovered some of the lost possessions of the house, and in 1089 Abbot Simeon began the erection of a new minster, on a scale which rivalled the great cathedral church built by his brother Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, in the old capital of Wessex. At Ely as at Winchester the Norman transepts remain in their original stately and massive grandeur.

and at Ely.

Exemption from episcopal control became, as time went on, a great aim of all monastic houses, and the example of the regulars was followed in many instances by the seculars also in cathedral and collegiate churches. Lanfranc, however, monk though he was, enforced his episcopal authority with a high hand over the Abbey of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, which claimed independence of all external jurisdiction. He was accused by the brethren of having craftily obtained from the Norman abbot Scotland certain concessions which infringed this right of exemption; and on the death of Scotland he bestowed his official benediction upon Guy, another Norman, whom he or the king[1] had nominated. Accompanied by Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, he went to the abbey and introduced Guy to the brethren as their abbot, but the monks, either from some personal dislike to the man or from resentment at not having been consulted

[1] The event occurred in 1088, a year after the death of William the Conqueror.

in the appointment, refused to receive him. The archbishop however installed Guy by his own authority, and confided the church to his care. The refractory monks meanwhile withdrew and assembled near the Church of St. Mildthryth; but before the end of the day, being pressed by hunger, they repented of their obstinacy and sent a message to the primate promising submission. Lanfranc ordered them to return, and made them swear obedience to the abbot over the body of St. Augustine. Ælfwine the prior and some of the brethren were transferred to the cathedral monastery, to be kept under guard there; the chief instigators of the resistance were imprisoned in the castle, and some others were dispersed amongst various monastic houses. But even then peace was not secured. A year afterwards one of the monks, named Columban, was detected in a design to murder the new abbot. Lanfranc had him bound naked outside the abbey gate and publicly scourged, after which his hood was cut off, and he was expelled from the city. As Columban is a Celtic name, and the only other offender mentioned is one who bore the English name of Alfred, we may suspect that national feeling had something to do with the rebellion: the more so as when it broke out afresh after the death of Lanfranc we find the monks warmly supported by the citizens of Canterbury.

Resistance of monks at Canterbury.

Discreet and careful in their appointments to abbeys and bishoprics as Lanfranc and William were, and pure from all suspicion of simony, there can be no doubt that they sometimes made grievous mistakes. Orderic, indeed, distinctly says, that they were occasionally taken in by men who affected great piety, but who only paid court to them to obtain ecclesiastical preferment. Many of the native abbots, he says, were deposed without a canonical trial, and the violent and sanguinary struggle at Glastonbury between the monks and their new abbot was only a sample of what occurred in not a few other places.

In striking contrast to the self-seeking courtiers, the same writer relates how one high-minded Norman monk, Guitmund, of the Abbey of St. Leutfred, who had crossed the channel by William's order, refused to accept any preferment in the conquered country. How, he said,

A high-minded monk.

could he, a foreigner, ignorant of the language and customs of the people, dare to rule over men whose fathers, brothers, and friends had been slain, imprisoned, or exiled by the king? Elections to ecclesiastical offices should be canonically made, and how could he, a monk, who was bound by the rule of his profession to despise the world, consent to share in the spoils of war? For his own part he should go back to Normandy and leave the rich booty of England to those who loved the dross of this world. He preferred the poverty embraced by St. Benedict to all the riches of this world. The long speech which Orderic puts in his mouth contains a warning to the king against the pride and insolence of conquest. He owed his kingdom not to hereditary right, but to the free favour of God, and the friendship of his kinsman the late King Eadward. Others had a stronger claim to the crown, and, therefore, a strict account of his stewardship would be required.

Whether Guitmund actually uttered these bold words or not, it is certain that he did not forfeit the Conqueror's favour or respect. When the archbishopric of Rouen became vacant in 1079, William offered it to him. But Guitmund had made enemies by his plain speaking, and since nothing could be said against his virtue or learning, his appointment was opposed on the ground that he was the son of a priest. Being a man of peace, he asked leave of his abbot, Odilo, to make a pilgrimage in foreign lands. At Rome his worth was recognised by Pope Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), who made him a cardinal, and Gregory's successor, Urban II., appointed him to the archbishopric of Aversa, a city which the Normans had founded in the conquered territory of Apulia. There he could minister to his own countrymen with a quiet conscience.

Ecclesiastical councils.

The primacy of Lanfranc is distinguished by the large number of councils over which he presided. They were held at London, Winchester, and Gloucester at the same time as the royal councils but distinct from them. This arrangement was a departure from the old English system, in which ecclesiastical and civil affairs had been debated and determined in the same assembly. The first approach to their separation occurred before the appointment of Lanfranc, when the papal legates who were in England held a synod on the day after the assembly held by

the king. The most direct approximation to the later practice of Convocation sitting simultaneously with Parliament, yet distinct from it, occurs in 1085, when after the king and his Witan had sat for five days, the primate and clergy prolonged their sitting for three days more. The king's name rarely appears in the acts of these councils, but we know that he kept a vigilant eye and a firm control over their proceedings, not permitting anything to be decreed or forbidden which was not agreeable to his will.

A more momentous change, charged with more far-reaching consequences, was the establishment of distinct courts for the trial of ecclesiastical causes. Hitherto they had been heard in the court of the shire or the hundred, where the bishop sat with the ealdorman, and they were decided like civil causes according to the common law of the realm. The Conqueror and the primate conceived it to be part of their duty, as reformers of the Church after the Roman model, to put an end to this practice. A decree issued in the king's name pronounced the ecclesiastical laws in England to be bad and contrary to the direction of the sacred canons, and declared his intention of amending them. Accordingly, he decreed by his royal authority that henceforth no bishop or archdeacon should sit in the shire-mot or hundred-mot, and that no cause pertaining to the cure of souls should be tried by laymen. The bishops were to have courts of their own, in which all ecclesiastical offences should be determined according to canon law.

Ecclesiastical and civil courts divided.

The intention of William in this measure clearly was to establish good order in Church and State, by marking out distinctly the lines of secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Of the latter, the Archbishop of Canterbury was to be the head, though the king reserved to himself the ultimate supreme authority in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil. It was a further application of the principle which he had already adopted in regard to the councils, and in the recent dispute about precedency between the sees of Canterbury and York. He did not anticipate the difficulties which would inevitably arise, if future kings and primates did not work together so harmoniously as he and Lanfranc did. Nor could he foresee the extent to

Effect of this separation.

which the canon law would gradually interfere with almost every department of human life, and sweep an infinite variety of causes into the Church courts, thus enhancing the power of the clergy and producing friction between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities.

A third change which seriously affected the condition of the Church was an order made by the council of London in 1075 for the removal of episcopal sees from villages to towns. The circumstances which led to the establishment of the English sees in early times not in cities, as was the invariable custom on the continent, but in country villages, or places where villages or towns grew up round the minster, have been explained in the first volume of this history.[1] The shifting of their position is another illustration of the policy by which King William and Lanfranc endeavoured to bring the English Church into closer conformity with the Churches on the continent.

Shifting of episcopal sees, 1075.

The order of the council of London was said to be made in accordance with the decrees of popes Damasus and Leo, and of the councils of Sardica and Laodicea, which forbade episcopal sees to be placed in villages. By virtue of this order the West Saxon see of Bishop Herman was moved from Sherborne to the hill of Old Sarum. Sherborne is cruelly described by William of Malmesbury as "a little village not attractive either from the number of its inhabitants or the nature of its situation, in which it was wonderful and almost shameful that an episcopal see should have lasted so long." The South Saxon see of Stigand was shifted from the remote village of Selsey to the old Roman city Chichester. The Mercian see of Bishop Peter was moved from Lichfield, described by William of Malmesbury as an insignificant village surrounded by woods, to the ancient city of Chester. His successor, however, Bishop Robert of Limesey, moved the see again to Coventry, tempted by the wealth and grandeur of the great minster founded there by Earl Leofric. The manner in which Robert established himself there was very like a plundering inroad. He entered the dormitory of the monks by force, and broke open their chests, quartered himself and his men on the house for eight days, took the horses, pulled down

[1] P. 317. See also pp. 171 and 403.

some of the houses and used the materials for building on his own manors. For these outrageous proceedings he was severely reprimanded by Lanfranc, and ordered to make restitution. Whether the order was obeyed or not there is no record. The probabilities are that it was not, as the archbishop, in one of his letters, complains that Robert had treated his epistles with great disrespect, flinging them on the ground and disdaining to read them. In any case Coventry continued to be the central church of the diocese, and the see was afterwards united with that of Lichfield.

In the course of a few years other changes were made, in conformity with the decree of the council of London. The East Anglian bishop Herfast removed his see from Elmham to Thetford in 1078, whence Herbert Losinga shifted it again in 1094 to busy populous Norwich. Remigius forsook the lowly see of Dorchester by the Thames in 1085 for the lordly hill of Lincoln, and John of Tours in 1088 removed his see from the little town of Wells, nestling under the Mendip hills, to the ancient Roman city of Bath.

In a council held at Winchester in 1076, some canons were passed respecting the marriage of the clergy, but these will be most conveniently mentioned in a later chapter, where the whole question of clerical celibacy and the successive canons issued on the subject will be dealt with.

Council at Winchester, 1076.

The same council pronounced marriages made without the blessing of the Church to be invalid, and in fact mere fornication. Care to guard the rights of the clergy against the cupidity of Norman bishops, or patrons and owners of estates, was shown in the order that no benefice in town or country should be subjected to any burden in addition to those which had been imposed upon it in the days of King Eadward. Laymen who were cited for trial in the bishops' court were to be excommunicated if they failed to answer to the third summons. The Conqueror, however, reserved the right of determining whether any of his own barons should be tried in the ecclesiastical court.

It is obvious that all the changes effected by the king and Lanfranc, the removal of native bishops and abbots, the rebuilding of cathedral and abbey churches on a grander

scale, the shifting of sees from country places to towns, the establishment of separate ecclesiastical courts and trial in accordance with canon law, the restrictions on the marriage of the clergy,—all tended to weaken the old insulated, national character of the English Church, assimilating it to the Churches on the continent, and bringing it into closer dependence on the see of Rome. At the same time, William jealously guarded the limits of this dependence, and would never yield such an absolute submission to Rome as to impair his own supremacy. In the subsequent struggles between the English Church and the papacy, this attitude of William furnished a principle and precedent for resistance which was not lost sight of.

Results of changes.

The relation between William and Pope Alexander had been of the most cordial character. Not long after the appointment of Lanfranc to the primacy, the pope addressed a letter to the Conqueror in which he thanks God, that in an age of unusual depravity his "dearest son William, renowned king of the English," is distinguished amongst all other princes for his devotion to religion, his zeal in putting down simony, and in confirming the rights and liberties of the Church. He exhorts him to follow up this good beginning and win the reward of perseverance, to rule his kingdom righteously, to defend ecclesiastical persons from injury, to protect and relieve the widows, the orphans and oppressed, since the King of kings and supreme Judge of the universe will require an account of his administration of the kingdom committed to his care, especially in respect of those who have neither strength nor arms to defend themselves. He recommends the king to be guided in his duty by the advice of Lanfranc, one of the foremost of the sons of Rome, whom the pope regrets not to have constantly by his side as his own counsellor, but consoles himself for his absence by the benefit which he has conferred upon the English Church.

William and Pope Alexander II.

In Gregory VII., the successor of Alexander, William had to deal with a stronger and more ambitious pontiff.

In a letter, which has not been preserved, he had congratulated Hildebrand on his accession to the papal throne in 1074, and Gregory in his reply expresses his con-

fident reliance upon the support of William in the troubles and difficulties by which he finds himself surrounded. In 1078 the pope addressed a letter to the king respecting the necessity of either appointing an assistant bishop for the archbishopric of Rouen, or else of appointing a new primate. The tone of this letter is one of cordial friendship and confidence. But in another, dated two years later, there is a perceptible change. We may therefore infer with some probability that it was between these two dates that Gregory had ventured on making a bold demand which William met with a blunt refusal.

William and Gregory VII.

The papal legate Hubert was the bearer of a letter in which Gregory requested that the payment of Peterpence should be made more regularly; and that William should make a profession of fealty to him and his successors. The reply of William was dignified and decisive. "One claim I admit, the other I do not admit. To do fealty I have not been willing in the past, nor am I willing now, inasmuch as I have never promised it, nor do I discover that my predecessors ever did it to your predecessors. In the collection of the money there has been negligence during my absence in Gaul for nearly three years, but now that by the divine mercy I have returned to my kingdom, I send by the hands of your legate what has been already collected, and the remainder shall be transmitted by the envoy of our faithful Archbishop Lanfranc, as soon as may be convenient. Pray for us and for the state of our realm, for your predecessors were beloved by us, and we desire to render to you, above all, sincere affection and obedience."

Demands of Gregory VII.

This respectful but firm reply showed Gregory how far he might go in dealing with William. William would be his dutiful and affectionate son, but not his vassal or slave. It was very probably after this attempt of Gregory that the king issued an order forbidding any one in his dominions to receive letters from the pope which had not first been shown to himself, or from acknowledging any one as pope without his sanction.

Relations between the king and the pope.

Gregory was wise enough not to renew his claims, nor did he attempt to promulgate in England the decree which he was enforcing with such violence against the Emperor

Henry IV., that no bishop or abbot should receive his ring or staff of office from any lay lord. In a letter to Hugh, Bishop of Die in Burgundy, Gregory remarks, that although the King of England does not bear himself in all things so religiously as he could wish, yet inasmuch as he does not destroy or sell the churches of God, exercises a rule of peace and justice among his subjects, refuses to enter into alliance with certain enemies of the Cross of Christ (the allusion, no doubt, is to Henry IV. and his partisans), has compelled priests to give up their wives, and laymen to pay their arrears of tithe, he has proved himself worthy of more honour than other princes, and deserves to be treated with special mildness and respect.

Lanfranc and Pope Gregory VII.

The attitude of William towards the pope is reflected in that of Lanfranc, and we cannot doubt that they consulted and agreed together what line of conduct they would adopt. During the pontificate of his old friend Alexander II., Lanfranc seems to have asked his advice and sanction at every step of his administration, but his deference to the apostolic see fell short of what Gregory considered to be due. In the first year of his elevation to the papacy he wrote a letter severely upbraiding the primate for permitting Herfast, Bishop of Elmham, to interfere with some of the privileges of the Abbey of St. Edmundsbury. These privileges had been confirmed, he said, by the apostolic see, which was insulted by any infringement of them. Lanfranc is peremptorily commanded to warn William, "that most beloved king and singular good son of the holy Roman Church," as he values his reputation for prudence, to restrain the iniquitous attempts of Herfast. Otherwise, Herfast and the Abbot Baldwin must repair to the apostolical see for the determination of the question at issue. We learn from a letter of Lanfranc to the pope that Gregory had reproached him with being less respectful to the Roman see since his elevation to the primacy. Lanfranc protests that neither the change in his position nor his distance from Rome had made any alteration in his sentiments. He is still prepared to render the same obedience in all things to the commands of the pope, according to the precepts of the canons. He hints that it is rather Gregory than himself who has somewhat cooled in his affection.

With regard to the recent message of the pope, conveyed by his legate, Hubert, he had done his best; he had made a suggestion to the king but had not succeeded. "I used my powers of suasion, but failed to persuade" ("suasi sed non persuasi"). Why he did not assent the king himself would explain by letter. The language of Lanfranc is guarded and not very explicit, but it is certain that Gregory continued to be dissatisfied with his conduct.

In two subsequent letters Gregory reprimands him sharply for failing to answer a summons to Rome. He has been informed that this negligence is due to fear of the king or to his own indifference. No intimidation from any earthly power ought to deter him from the discharge of this duty. If the king, whom the pope still loves above other princes, is becoming uplifted by pride or arrogance, it behoves Lanfranc to warn him and to bring him back to a better mind.

The pope upbraids Lanfranc.

In the second letter Lanfranc is still more severely reprimanded for his contumacy in disobeying reiterated citations to Rome, and is even threatened with deposition if he does not present himself by the feast of All Saints, four months after the date of the letter. There is no evidence, however, that this threatening language had any effect upon the primate.

A principal cause probably of Lanfranc's reluctance to visit Rome was that he and his royal master wished to maintain an attitude of prudent reserve in the strife between Gregory and the Emperor Henry IV. This is clearly indicated in a letter of Lanfranc to an unknown correspondent, after Henry had set up an anti-pope in the person of Wibert (Clement III.), and had been crowned by him. Lanfranc's correspondent was a vehement partisan of the emperor, and the primate reproves him for reviling Gregory, for calling him Hildebrand, and his legates thorny fellows (*spinosulos*), and for so loudly and hastily extolling Clement. No one should be praised or disparaged in his lifetime, for no one can tell what others really are, or will be, in the sight of God. He believes, however, that the renowned emperor could not have attempted so daring a deed without strong reasons for it; and that he could not have won so signal a victory without divine aid.

The pope and the emperor.

Meanwhile he does not recommend his correspondent to come to England without first obtaining license from the king of the English. "For our island has not yet repudiated the former pope, and has not declared whether it should obey the present one. Both sides will be heard, and then perhaps it will be possible to see more clearly what ought to be done." Thus the attitude both of William and Lanfranc towards the papacy was respectful, but reserved and cautious: neither would sacrifice his independence.

Lanfranc's patriarchal authority.

As Archbishop of Canterbury, indeed, Lanfranc exercised a kind of patriarchal power, which extended beyond the limits of his own province. The clergy and people of Dublin address him in terms of humble submission, and pray him to consecrate one Patrick, whom they have elected bishop of their city, the metropolis of Ireland. Pope Gregory himself desires him to repress the vice, which he understands to be prevalent amongst the Scotch, of men not only deserting their wives but selling them. In a letter to Margaret, the good Queen of Malcolm, King of Scotland, Lanfranc expresses unbounded thankfulness for her piety, and his great pleasure at having been chosen by her as her spiritual father and adviser, an honour of which he feels unworthy, but which he will endeavour to deserve. He sends, at her request, brother Goldewin, and two others to assist him in the instruction of her people, begging her to send them back as soon as she can spare them, as their services are much needed at Canterbury.

He writes to Guthric, prince of one of the Danish settlements in Ireland, informing him that he has duly consecrated Patrick Bishop of Dublin, and has been pleased to hear from him a good report of the prince's conduct; he exhorts him to adhere steadfastly to the right faith as delivered to the apostles and orthodox fathers, and to manifest his faith by good works, showing himself severe to the proud, and mild to the humble. But he must endeavour to put down some evil practices which he hears are common amongst the Irish,—men making marriages with women of their own kindred, or sisters of their deceased wives, others deserting their wives, or exchanging them, and such like iniquities.

Similar vices are denounced in a letter to another Irish

prince, together with some ecclesiastical irregularities, such as bishops being consecrated by one bishop only, infants baptized without the consecrated chrism, bishops receiving money for conferring holy orders.

An Irish bishop, Domnaldus, asked him whether persons, especially infants, dying before they had received the Holy Eucharist, were lost. Lanfranc replied that such was not the opinion of the Church, either on the continent or in England. "We believe it to be most salutary that persons of all ages, whether in health or dying, should fortify themselves by partaking of the body and blood of the Lord. But if, having been baptized, they should happen to die before they have received it we by no means believe (God forbid) that they perish everlastingly, otherwise the passages in Holy Scripture which declare salvation through baptism would be void of truth and meaning." The saying of our Lord in the gospel, "unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," could not be literally fulfilled in every case. For many of the martyrs who died even before baptism, yet having suffered for Christ, were believed by the Church to be saved on the strength of the Lord's declaration, "Whoso shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven." "So also," he continues, "we must hold that it is possible for a believer to eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, not merely by the bodily mouth, but by means of love and tenderness of heart. To love and to believe joyfully with a pure conscience that Christ took upon Him our flesh for our salvation, that He hung on the cross, rose again, and ascended; to imitate His footsteps, and to share in His sufferings so far as human infirmity permits and divine grace vouchsafes, this is truly and healthfully to eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood." In support of this remarkable statement Lanfranc quotes a passage of St. Augustine commenting on the words, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." To eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood healthfully is to abide in Him, and to have Him abiding in us; for Judas, who betrayed the Lord, received with his mouth like the rest of the apostles; but inasmuch as he did not eat with his heart he received a judgment of eternal damnation."

The Irish bishop had asked Lanfranc some questions about secular literature. These, however, he declines to answer. It did not become a bishop to pay attention to studies of this kind. "We, indeed, ourselves once wasted our youth in these matters, but when we undertook a pastoral charge we determined that they ought to be renounced."

Most of Lanfranc's letters to bishops and abbots in England are concerned with discipline and illustrate the need of it.

Letters to English bishops and abbots.

Herfast, Bishop of Elmham, is severely reprimanded for having ordained a man deacon who had not passed through the minor orders of a clerk, had confessed to Lanfranc that he had a wife, and that he did not mean to part from her. He must be deprived of the diaconate, admitted to minor orders at the proper times, and not readmitted deacon unless he pledges himself to live in chastity henceforth. If he does this, then he is not to be reordained, but restored to his office as deacon by delivering to him a copy of the gospels, either in a regular synod or some large clerical assembly.

Maurice, Bishop of London, is instructed to visit the Abbey of Barking, where there was a quarrel between the abbess and the prioress. He was to hear the complaint on both sides, and then to command the abbess to be an abbess and the prioress to be a prioress in strict conformity with the rules of St. Benedict, the higher authority directing and the lesser obeying. Should he be unable to compose the strife and enforce compliance with the primate's orders, the case must be referred to Lanfranc himself.

To Bishop Gosfrid (? of Chichester) he writes in reply to a letter asking his advice, that women who had made their profession to keep the rule of a religious order, and those who, without having made their profession, were designated (*oblatæ*) for the religious life, must be constrained to live accordingly. Those who were neither professed nor designated might be dismissed for the present until their wishes could be more exactly ascertained. Others who had taken refuge in a monastery, as the bishop affirmed, not from love of religion but from fear of the Norman conquerors, might, if the professed sisters bore witness to the truth of their

assertion, be permitted to withdraw. In this decision Lanfranc says that the king concurred.

Nor were Lanfranc's energies confined to ecclesiastical affairs. He was in truth the first minister of the king, and was the chief guardian of the kingdom during William's absences in Normandy; the king's half-brother, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, and William of Warenne being his assistant counsellors and agents. The revolt of Ralph of Wader, Earl of East Anglia, and Roger, Earl of Hereford, in 1074, was suppressed by forces which Lanfranc organised. The insurrection was planned at a wedding-feast, "that bride ale, to many men's bale," when all kinds of grievances and complaints against the king and his government were brought forward. Waltheof, Earl of Huntingdon and Northampton, was present, but to what extent he assented to the rash counsels of rebellion is uncertain.

Lanfranc guardian of the kingdom.

The plans of the conspirators did not escape the vigilance of the archbishop. To Earl Roger he wrote as a father to a son, expressing the surprise and sorrow with which he had heard rumours of his treasonable designs. He implores him for his own sake and the sake of his father, William Fitz-Osbern, who had been an old and faithful vassal of the king, to abandon his evil intentions. If he will come to Lanfranc and explain and exculpate himself he shall be guaranteed a safe journey. Two letters were written in this strain. The earl, however, paid no heed to the invitation, and in a third letter the archbishop informs him that, with inexpressible grief, since he formerly loved him and wished to serve him with all his heart, he had been compelled to excommunicate him and all his abettors. Roger, it seems, had now intimated a desire to come to see the archbishop, but Lanfranc informs him that it is now too late. Personally he was still quite willing to meet him, but he dared not for fear of incurring the wrath of the king. He would, however, send a messenger and letters to his master, intimating Roger's penitence, and petition for pardon, and would assist him as far as he could, consistently with his fidelity to the king. Meanwhile he entreated him to keep quiet, and not to attempt anything which would increase the anger of his royal master.

Revolt of two earls, 1075.

The archbishop's praiseworthy efforts to prevent the outbreak of revolt were unsuccessful. The two earls mustered their forces (that of Earl Ralph consisting largely of Bretons), and they endeavoured to effect a junction; but they were intercepted, and ultimately defeated. Lanfranc kept the king duly informed of the progress of events. In his first letter he begs him not to trouble himself to cross the sea, for although they would welcome his coming as an angel of God, yet they should regard it as a disgrace to require his assistance in putting down a mere rabble of perjured robbers. Ralph the Earl, or rather the Traitor, and his whole army had been routed, and were being pursued by a vast host of Normans and English. He was informed by the leaders that in a few days they would all have fled beyond sea, or be captured either dead or alive.

The earls defeated.

In his next despatch Lanfranc writes in a strain of thanksgiving. "Glory to God in the highest, by whose mercy your kingdom has been purged of the filth of the Bretons. The Castle of Norwich has been surrendered, and the Bretons who were in it and had lands in England have sworn, in return for life and limb, to quit your realm within forty days and not to come back without your license. . . . By the mercy of God the din of war is now hushed in England."

Earl Roger was condemned, on the return of William, to imprisonment for life; and Earl Waltheof, although he had taken no active part in the revolt, was accused of sympathy with the rebels, and after many months of imprisonment was beheaded at Winchester. This deed, which was certainly not justified by the conduct of the earl, must be regarded as one of the blots on William's reign, and proves that in his sterner and more suspicious moods he was not amenable even to the influence of Lanfranc; for Lanfranc had declared his conviction of the earl's innocence, and when Waltheof became (like Simon de Montfort in later times) an object of popular veneration, the archbishop expressed approval of it, and said that he should be happy if, after his death, he himself might enjoy the same rest as that into which Waltheof had entered.

Fate of Earl Waltheof.

Lanfranc had proved himself a strong and capable guardian of the realm during the king's absence. Seven years after-

wards, in 1082, on another critical occasion, William was indebted to his assistance in a different way. The pride and cruelty of Bishop Odo had long been offensive to the king and a source of danger to the stability of his rule. The prophecy of a soothsayer that Pope Gregory VII. would be succeeded by one bearing the name of Odo filled the prelate's vain mind with a crazy ambition. He bought himself a palace in Rome and made large presents to the leading citizens, and was setting out at the head of a kind of army for Italy when he was surprised and detained in the Isle of Wight by William, who had hastily crossed over from Normandy. The king summoned an assembly of his great men, and submitted to them his complaints against his brother,—his oppressions, his cruelties, his plunder of churches, his seduction of the king's knights to support himself in an enterprise of personal ambition, when they were needed at home to defend the realm against the Danes and the Irish. Such a disturber of the public peace and safety must be restrained. He bade his barons lay hold of Odo and put him in ward; but there was no man who dared to arrest him, being a bishop. William then seized him with his own hands. Odo claimed the privilege of his order: "I am a clerk, and it is unlawful to condemn a bishop without the sanction of the pope." The subtle mind of Lanfranc, trained in the lawyers' craft, suggested the king's answer: "I do not seize the Bishop of Bayeux. I seize the Earl of Kent." As Earl of Kent, accordingly, Odo was carried off to Normandy and imprisoned in the Castle of Rouen. Pope Gregory in his private correspondence fiercely denounced the deed as a wicked outrage and insult, but his letter to William was couched in milder language, no doubt because he did not wish to lower himself by making demands or issuing threats which he very well knew would be ineffective. Odo was kept in prison at Rouen during the five remaining years of William's life. At the earnest entreaty of his brother, the Earl of Mortain, he was included in the general release of prisoners granted by the Conqueror on his deathbed in 1087.

Seizure of Bishop Odo, 1082.

The energy with which Lanfranc discharged the manifold duties that fell to his lot is the more remarkable and praiseworthy since it is clear from his private correspondence

that the difficulties and burdens of his position weighed heavily upon his spirits. In a letter written, soon after his appointment, to Pope Alexander II., he bitterly regrets having accepted it. The peril both to his own soul and to the Church from the troubles and evils of every kind by which he was surrounded made him weary of his life. He beseeches the pope to release him from his bondage and suffer him to return to the monastic life, which he loves above everything. He is not conscious of having effected any improvement in the religious condition of the country, or if any, so very small that it is quite outweighed by the damage done to his own soul.

Lanfranc's difficulties.

So also in a later letter to John, Archbishop of Rouen, he begs him not to attribute his silence to any lack of affection, but to excess of work (often of a secular kind), worry, and anxiety, which leave him very little leisure for writing, and when he has leisure he frequently finds it difficult to get trustworthy carriers.

No doubt as time went on Lanfranc became less querulous and despondent. The scholar and the monk grew into the ecclesiastical statesman, and a sense of the great importance of his position, and of his utility both to the Church and to the State, must have counteracted his earlier longing to sink back into the seclusion of the cloister. The ignorance of the native clergy and the low state of discipline in the monasteries fretted his soul until, by the appointment of new prelates and a vigorous perseverance in measures of reform, he had brought the Church in England up to the level of the Church in Normandy.

An interesting account of a meeting between him and his successor Anselm illustrates a certain hardness and narrowness of mind in Lanfranc which helps us to understand his difficulty in settling down to his work amongst a people whom he despised as rude and ignorant. On the death of Herluin, the first Abbot of Bec, in 1078, his office was conferred on the prior, the holy Anselm of Aosta. Soon after his appointment the new abbot paid a visit to England, where the house of Bec had many possessions. He was received as an honoured guest in the monastery of Christchurch, Canterbury. Eadmer, the friend and biographer of Anselm, records how the primate and the abbot, as the foremost

Lanfranc and Anselm.

churchmen of the day, the one in official authority and extent of learning, the other in holiness and divine wisdom, discoursed together on many matters of common interest. Amongst others, Lanfranc imparted his doubts as to the claim of some of the English saints to that title. For instance, one of his predecessors, Ælfheah by name, was venerated not merely as a saint but a martyr. He was no doubt a good man, but how could he fairly be called a martyr, seeing that he had not died to confess the name of Christ, but had been put to death by the Danes merely because he would not pay a ransom for his life?[1] The larger mind and larger heart of Anselm made short work of the doubts and scruples of Lanfranc. He who did not hesitate to die rather than commit a slight sin, would certainly not hesitate to die rather than commit a grave one. To deny Christ was certainly a graver sin than to obtain a ransom for one's life at the cost of suffering to those from whom it was raised. Archbishop Ælfheah died rather than commit this lighter sin. Therefore he would certainly have died rather than commit the greater sin of denying Christ. He died rather than commit an unrighteous act; John Baptist had died because he would speak the truth, and he was rightly reckoned a martyr; but if Christ was truth, He was also righteousness, and therefore to die for righteousness was to die for Christ. Ælfheah therefore had a good claim to the title of martyr. Lanfranc declared himself entirely convinced by the simple yet subtle reasoning of Anselm. Henceforth, by his orders, St. Ælfheah was venerated with special honours in the church at Canterbury, and, as we all know, he has kept his place to this day as St. Alphege in the kalendar of the English Church,—April 19.

[1] See vol. i. p. 385.

AUTHORITIES.—For events in Glastonbury and Westminster, Will. of Malmesb. *de Antiq. Glast.* ed. Hearne; *Chron. Petrib.* For St. Albans, *Annal. Monast.* vol. ii. (Rolls series). For Battle Abbey, *Chron. de Bello.* For Peterborough and Ely, *Chron. Petrib.*; *Hist. Eliensis in Anglia Sacra*, vol. ii. For account of the monk Guitmand, Orderic Vital. pp. 524-526. For separation of courts, Bp. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 85. For removal of sees, Will. of Malmesb., *Gest. Pont.*, and Wilkins's *Concilia.* For acts of Lanfranc and relation of the pope to him and to the king, Lanfranci Epp., *Opera*, ed. Giles, and Jaffe's *Monumenta Gregoriana.* For Anselm's visit to Lanfranc, Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, i. 5. 40-44 (Rolls series); Freeman, *Norm. Conq.* vol. iv. pp. 441-444.

CHAPTER IV

WILLIAM RUFUS AND RALPH FLAMBARD

WILLIAM declared on his deathbed that he could not dare to name any one as his successor to the English throne, because he had won it by force and bloodshed rather than by hereditary right. He therefore commended the disposition of the kingdom to God, whose servant he was, and in whose hand were all things. Yet, if it were God's will, he trusted that his son William, who had been faithful to him from his earliest years, might wield the English sceptre, and wield it long and happily. He dictated a letter to Lanfranc expressing his hopes, and begging him to crown his son if he considered the act justifiable. Thus the actual choice of king was referred to the judgment of the primate.

Dying wishes of William the Conqueror.

William Rufus immediately set out for England. He crossed from Touques, when he heard of his father's death, and, after a brief stay at Winchester, where he seized the royal treasure, he sought out Lanfranc at Canterbury and urged him to act in accordance with the dying wishes of the late king. Eadmer says, or at least implies, that Lanfranc hesitated, but his scruples seem to have been overcome by the promises which William made on oath that he would do justice and keep mercy, defend the peace, liberty, and security of the Church against all comers, and defer in all matters to the advice and judgment of the primate.

William Rufus in England.

As there had been no direct nomination of the new king, so was there no formal election. The Witan were not

summoned. There was no opposition on the part of the people. In the language of the Chronicle, "All men in England to him bowed and to him oaths swore," and on Sept. 25, 1087, less than three weeks after the death of his father, William the Red was crowned by Lanfranc in Westminster Abbey. We may well believe that Lanfranc performed the ceremony with a heavy heart, and with many forebodings of ill, for he must have known that William was a profligate and profane man. On the other hand, he had been faithful to his father when his brother rebelled, he had displayed considerable military ability, his father had expressed a wish that he should succeed to the throne, he had taken a solemn oath to rule well, and it might be hoped that, in a new and responsible position, he would amend the errors of his past life.

Lanfranc crowns him, Sept. 25, 1087.

His first actions promised well. He went to Winchester and out of the vast treasure which had been hoarded there he made, in accordance with his father's dying wishes, liberal gifts to the churches and the poor. All the great minsters received either six or ten marks each in gold, together with offerings of manuscripts, crosses, altars, candlesticks or other furniture, richly ornamented with gold, silver, or precious stones. The abbey of Battle, in addition to other costly gifts, was honoured with the royal mantle of its founder, the departed king. Churches in towns or on royal lordships received sixty pennies each, and a hundred pounds was sent to each shire to be distributed amongst the poor for the benefit of the late king's soul.

He begins well.

Having discharged these duties of filial piety, he proceeded from Winchester to Westminster, where he kept the Christmas feast and held the winter council. It was attended by the two archbishops, by Maurice, Bishop of London, Walkelin of Winchester, Osbern of Exeter, Wulfstan of Worcester, William of Thetford, Robert of Chester, and William of Durham. The only sinister omen was the appearance of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. The Conqueror, on his deathbed, had reluctantly consented to his release from prison, predicting that much evil would come of it; and his forebodings were fulfilled. William reinstated him in the earldom of Kent, and in the

Bp. Odo reinstated.

He leads a Norman rebellion.

very next year (1088) Odo acted as the chief instigator and leader of a rebellion of the Norman nobles against William in favour of his brother Robert.

William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham.

William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham, was at first the counsellor in whom the king reposed the highest confidence. It is said, indeed, that all England followed his "rede," but in a little time he also went over to the side of the Bishop of Bayeux. Another leader of the rebel force was Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, who was more skilled in training mail-clad soldiers for war than in teaching surpliced clerks to chant psalms. It was a purely Norman insurrection. The native English as a body stood firmly by William. Thirty thousand Englishmen voluntarily placed themselves at his service, and with the solitary exception of the Bishop of Durham the whole of the hierarchy in England were heartily on the side of the king. Eminent amongst them was the one remaining bishop of English birth—the holy Wulfstan. His city of Worcester was one of the principal objects of attack.

Rebels routed at Worcester. St. Wulfstan.

The Norman garrison of the castle remained staunch to William, and they had such respect and reverence for Wulfstan that they entreated him to take up his abode for the time being in the castle, declaring that in the event of more danger they should value the protection of his holy presence. Wulfstan assented to their wishes; he entered the castle with the men of his household and his military retainers, all armed for battle; and all the citizens of Worcester declared themselves ready to go forth and fight for the king. It was not long before the bishop and his followers, looking westwards from the castle walls, could discern the rebel army advancing on the other side of the river Severn, ravaging the lands of the bishopric. Soldiers and citizens now besought leave of the bishop to go forth and meet the enemy. Wulfstan bade them go, and having pronounced a solemn anathema against the sacrilegious rebels, encouraged the royalists by his blessing, and an assurance that they who fought for their king and fellow-citizens could not fail.

Thus animated, the defenders of the city rushed to the attack, and, falling upon the invaders when they were dispersed in search of plunder, completely routed them. The curse of

Wulfstan was believed, according to later legends, to have produced miraculous effects. The rebels were smitten with blindness, so that they could not distinguish friends from foes, and with weakness in their limbs, so that they were unable to hold their arms. Before midsummer of the year 1088 the whole revolt had been crushed and the detested Odo had been banished from England never to return. He remained Bishop of Bayeux, but ceased to be Earl of Kent. William, the son of the Norman Conqueror, had successfully defeated a Norman insurrection largely by the aid of his English subjects.

Meanwhile the Bishop of Durham had abandoned the cause of the king, but had been unable to give any help to the rebels. When first summoned to the royal array, he had promised to attend with the seven knights who were with him at court—probably the seven chief barons of his bishopric—and to send to Durham for more. But instead of doing this he withdrew from court without the king's leave, taking some of the king's men with him. Thereupon the king ordered the temporalities of the bishop to be seized and the bishop himself to be arrested. He escaped to his castle at Durham; but the king's officers in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire took possession of his estates, his effects, and his men in the king's name. The bishop wrote from Durham demanding restitution, protesting his innocence, and offering to answer for himself in the king's court, if the king would grant him a safe-conduct.

Bp. William of Durham accused of treason.

The king, in the presence of the bishop's messenger, made grants out of some of the episcopal lands to certain of his barons, thus intimating that they were for the present, at any rate, forfeited; but he sent word to the bishop that he might come to the royal court, and if he was not minded to stay there, he should be permitted to return to Durham in safety. The bishop, however, did not consider it prudent to accept this invitation without a formal safe-conduct in the king's name, which he obtained at last after considerable difficulty and delay.

The proceedings which took place after his arrival at court have a special interest and significance in view of the strife which was soon to come between the king and Anselm, and the later strife between Henry II. and Archbishop

Thomas Becket. The bishop appears to have been summoned for trial in the king's court, but he declined to plead except according to the privileges of his Order. This demand was refused. He then begged to be allowed to take counsel with his metropolitan, Thomas, Archbishop of York, and with the other bishops. This request was refused. He offered to clear himself on oath from any charge of perjury or treason. But this also was refused. The king insisted upon his choosing one of two alternatives—either to be tried in that court like a layman, or to return, with the safe-conduct already promised, to Durham. The bishop elected to return to Durham. This was in the month of June 1088. In the following November the bishop was again induced to present himself at the king's court at Salisbury. Three of the northern barons had pledged their faith for his personal safety, and further made themselves responsible for the fulfilment of certain conditions favourable to the bishop, whatever the result of the trial might be. The principal speaker on the king's side was the primate Lanfranc, and there was a great deal of preliminary fencing between him and the bishop on technical points of law. Amongst other things Bishop William maintained that he, and the bishops who were to try him, ought to be vested in their episcopal robes. Lanfranc treated this contention with some contempt. "We are very well able," he said, "to discuss the king's affairs and yours clothed as we now are, for garments do not hinder truth."

Trial of the bishop, 1088.

The essential question, however, was whether the bishop would do right to the king (*rectitudinem facere*), in other words, recognise the jurisdiction of the court. The lay members of the court joined with Lanfranc in firmly pressing this point. Bishop William denied their authority. "Suffer me," he said, "in my response to address myself to the archbishops and bishops. I have nothing to say to you. I did not come hither to receive your judgment. I altogether repudiate it."

He denies the authority of the court.

Meanwhile the charges against the bishop had not been formulated, and this was now done at the suggestion of the king, who up to this time seems to have kept silence. The duty was allotted to one Hugh of Beaumont, who fully set

forth the several acts and stages in the bishop's treason, more especially the fact that he had been basely plotting desertion at the very moment that he was advising the king how to act against the rebels. But the bishop declined to answer to charges which were formulated by a layman. "You may say what you will, Sir Hugh, but to thee I will make no reply this day." The lay members of the court began to wax impatient and tumultuous. At this juncture the Bishop of Coutances intervened, and recommended that the bishops and abbots should withdraw and consider whether the Bishop of Durham ought not to be reinstated in his bishopric before he was tried. Lanfranc, however, dismissed this suggestion with contempt. "There is no need for us to rise; let the bishop and his men go out, and we who remain, clergy and laity alike, can consider what we ought to do." Bishop William accordingly withdrew with his attendants, after warning the assembly once more that unless he was canonically judged by those who were canonically qualified to judge him, he should repudiate their judgment.

The bishop having withdrawn, his case was debated by the whole court, which included not only all the chief officials of the State, but even the king's huntsmen. When the bishop was recalled the Archbishop of York announced the decision of the court. Until he acknowledged the jurisdiction of the court the king would not reinstate him in his fief. The bishop once more claimed the right of taking counsel with his brother bishops, but his claim was overruled by Lanfranc with the objection that the bishops, being his judges, could not be his counsel. The king then interposed, giving him permission to consult with his own men, but with them alone. Thereupon the bishop once more withdrew with his seven barons, and on his return startled the assembly by declaring that as he despaired of justice in a court which was not legally qualified to try him, and to which he had not been canonically summoned, he appealed to the apostolic see of Rome, to the Blessed Peter and his vicar, to whose judgment the greater ecclesiastical causes had been reserved from ancient times by the authority of the apostles, their successors, and the canons of the Church.

He appeals to Rome.

This appeal of Bishop William was a daring assertion of the

right of the pope to be the final arbiter, not in a question of doctrine or ecclesiastical discipline but of loyalty to a national sovereign. Lanfranc, with his customary caution, did not directly deny the right of appeal to Rome even in such a case as this, but in defending the authority of the king's court he drew with lawyer-like precision the distinction between bishopric and fief, maintaining the right of the court to deal with the latter, and quoting as a precedent the case of Odo, who had been apprehended and tried not as bishop but as earl. Bishop William professed himself unable to contend with Lanfranc on nice points of this kind. He had appealed to Rome, and he now asked permission to go there. Once more he was requested to withdraw that the question might be debated, and was presently recalled to hear the final sentence of the court, which was that as he had refused to answer the charges brought against him, and had appealed to Rome, his fief was forfeited. The bishop only reiterated his contempt for the court and his determination to seek at Rome the help of God and Saint Peter.

His fief is forfeited.

He further demanded a safe-conduct out of the kingdom. The king, who had hitherto exhibited remarkable patience, now waxed fierce, and after much wrangling swore by his favourite oath, "the holy face of Lucca," that no safe-conduct should be granted until the bishop's castle at Durham should have been surrendered into the hands of the royal officers. The king's men having taken possession of the castle, delivered to the bishop's men a writ, under the king's seal, of safe-conduct for the bishop, through the kingdom and out of it. Even after this, the embarcation of the bishop was delayed on various pretexts for many days. At length, through the intercession of those northern barons who had originally pledged their faith for his safety, he was permitted to sail from Southampton.

Durham Castle surrendered.

Having been honourably received by Duke Robert in Normandy, he was entrusted with a large share in the administration of the duchy, and in the cares and interests of this new employment he appears to have abandoned his intention of carrying an appeal to Rome. Nor, as events turned out, was it necessary. In the third year of his exile he did the king a good turn by persuading the

The bishop goes to Normandy.

assailants of one of his fortresses in Normandy to give up the siege, just as they were on the point of capturing it. Peace was soon afterwards made between the king and his brother Robert, and the bishop was included amongst those whom the king was bound by the terms of the treaty to restore to land and honours. He was not only reinstated in his bishopric but re-admitted to the position of a confidential councillor. The see had been kept vacant during his exile and the castle had remained in the hands of the king, but the monastery had not been despoiled of any of its property, and the bishop did not return empty-handed, but brought back a goodly store of books for the library, and gold and silver vessels and ornaments for the Church.

He is reinstated at Durham.

The case of Bishop William is a somewhat tangled and tedious tale, but it has an interest of its own as the first instance, since the case of Wilfrith in the seventh century,[1] of a direct appeal in England to papal jurisdiction on the presumption of its being superior to the law of the land, and the authority of the sovereign. The man himself does not command our respect or admiration. He does not stand forth, like Anselm, as the pure-minded defender of righteousness and justice against vice and iniquity, or like Thomas of Canterbury as the stout and honest champion of the privileges of his Order. He was an unprincipled intriguer, who resorted to every species of legal subtlety and sophistry to evade being brought to trial for treasonable conduct; and when all other devices failed him he appealed to the highest ecclesiastical authority as a last expedient to escape the consequences of a civil crime. But that such an appeal should have been made at all was a momentous event in the history of the English Church, and that the primate who, throughout the dispute, had upheld the authority of the royal court did not venture directly to question the right of appeal is a significant proof of the extent to which the claims of Rome might be pushed without being disputed. The whole process of the trial of Bishop William enables us to realise what a strong overruling power in Church as well as State had been lost by the death of William the

The interest of his case.

[1] See vol. i. p. 147.

Conqueror. His master mind and will would have made short work of the sophistical pleadings of the bishop, and the appeal to Rome would probably never have been made, or if it had been made would have been peremptorily prohibited.

The promises of good government which William the Red had made at his coronation, and had renewed when he wanted to secure the help of his subjects to suppress the Norman rebellion, were soon to be broken; and the reign which had begun brightly became darkened by oppression, inflicted impartially on Norman and English, of all ranks, and all orders. But so long as Lanfranc lived no open wrong was done to the Church. Thurstan indeed, who had been deposed in the last reign from the abbotship of Glastonbury on account of his violence,[1] was restored, and it was strongly suspected that he had bought his restoration by a present of 500 pounds of silver for the king's treasury. Bishoprics and abbeys, however, were not as yet kept vacant, a practice which was soon to be one of the king's principal offences. The see of Chichester, which became vacant by the death of Stigand in September 1087, was promptly filled up by the appointment of Gosfrid. Gisa, Bishop of Wells, died in the following year, and the king bestowed the see on John de Villula, a learned physician of Tours, whom he was wont to consult and employ on many affairs. The abbotship of Bath fell vacant soon afterwards by the death of Ælfsige, and was now conveyed to Bishop John at his request, and to his successors in the see. The grant was made by the king at Winchester and afterwards confirmed by a council at Dover.

The king begins evil practices.

Acting on the rule laid down in the council of London 1075 that bishoprics should be removed from villages to towns, Bishop John transferred his throne from Wells to Bath. The change was extremely distasteful both to the canons of Wells and the monks of Bath, for Bishop John was an oppressive master to both bodies. The canonical revenues at Wells were cut down, the canons were turned out of the buildings, including the common dormitory and refectory which Bishop Gisa had erected for them, and had to shift for themselves as well as they could in the town. The English monks at Bath did not fare much better. The

See of Wells removed to Bath.

[1] See above, p. 43.

office of abbot was merged in the bishopric; the foreign bishop despised the monks as illiterate; their revenues were reduced, and their allowance of food diminished. After a time, as the English monks died off and the house was gradually filled with brethren selected by the bishop, he treated it more liberally, restoring some of the property, rebuilding the church, and bestowing ornaments upon it, and gifts of books.

Archbishop Lanfranc died on May 24, 1089, and was buried amidst universal mourning in the metropolitan cathedral, which he had rebuilt. He deserves a very high place amongst great men of the second rank. With the learning of a scholar, a lawyer, and a theologian, he combined practical wisdom, shrewdness, prudence, and tact. His moral standard was of the monastic type, somewhat austere and wanting in sympathy, and his natural preference was for a life of study and seclusion in the cloister; but he was called to occupy the position of an ecclesiastical statesman, and he proved himself worthy of it. He had too little originality to merit the name of genius, and too much of worldly wisdom and lawyer-like craft to entitle him to be called a saint. But if he had been either a genius or a saint, it is probable that his administration as primate would have been less successful than it actually was. A genius who could brook no opposition to his own lofty aims, or a saint whose zeal was not tempered by discretion and common sense, would probably have come into conflict with the masterful mind and will of the king, with disastrous results to Church and State. Happily Lanfranc thoroughly understood the character of the Conqueror; he knew that the King of England would, like the Duke of Normandy, be supreme in all matters ecclesiastical as well as civil, and that if his will was violently thwarted he might be irritated into acts of harshness and injustice. By contenting himself with advising and suggesting, without attempting to dictate, the primate won the confidence, respect, and affection of the king, and became his chief counsellor and minister in all affairs of importance. That two such great and strong men should have worked together so harmoniously for the common weal of Church and State, was the wonder and admiration of the age in which they lived; it was the nearest approach that the world had seen to that concord and

Lanfranc dies: his character.

co-operation of the chief secular and spiritual powers which was the ideal, ever cherished but never realised, in the relations between emperor and pope. And even at this distance of time we may recognise with thankfulness the results of the joint labours of the Conqueror and the primate. By the impartial administration of justice, the fusion of the two races, English and Norman, was facilitated; by the appointment of men to the chief offices in the Church, for the most part of high character, and free at any rate from all suspicion of simony, by the reform of discipline and promotion of learning in the monasteries, above all by the firm attitude assumed towards the papacy, respectful but not servile, they stamped a certain national character on the English Church which was not entirely forgotten or effaced in the vicissitudes of later times.

His death a calamity.

The removal from the counsels of the State of such a man as Lanfranc, with his consummate ability, mature experience, and strict integrity, would have been a serious loss at any time; but happening when it did, it was nothing less than calamitous. For Lanfranc was the only man who was able to exercise any moral control over the new king. Even to his admonition William had once contemptuously replied, "Who can keep all his promises?" but the extent of his restraining influence may be estimated by the marked deterioration in the conduct of the king after his decease.

Character of William Rufus.

William the Red had abilities which might have fitted him to become a powerful, if not a praiseworthy sovereign, had not the baser elements in his nature become paramount. Since his accession he had proved himself capable of retaining the allegiance of his English subjects, who heartily supported him in suppressing the Norman rebellion. He was an able soldier, although the accomplishment of his plans was often frustrated by strange fits of caprice. He was brave, and had once risked his own life to save his father's. The most redeeming feature, indeed, in his character was his dutiful obedience to his father while he lived, and a certain filial respect for his memory after his death. While he robbed and oppressed other churches he made bountiful gifts to the two abbeys founded by his father

—St. Stephen's at Caen and St. Martin's at the place of Battle. St. Stephen's, indeed, was enriched at the expense of Waltham Church, which he despoiled of some of its richest treasures for this purpose; but the enrichment of his father's abbey by the plunder of a house founded by his father's rival and enemy may have seemed a justifiable act. He is also said to have bestowed many gifts on the Cathedral Church of Lincoln for the benefit of his father's soul, and to have confirmed his father's gifts to the Hospital of St. Peter, afterward St. Leonard, at York. But the better qualities of the king were far outweighed by his vices,—coarse sensuality, and shameless avarice. Although murder and robbery were severely punished, yet the worst criminal might escape, even when the halter was round his neck, by a present to the royal treasury. The whole country suffered cruelly from the licentiousness and plunder of his foreign mercenaries, whom he attracted into his service from all parts of Europe by high pay. His own profligacy was loathsome, his blasphemy and mockery of holy things and persons open and revolting. Naturally the court of such a king became a sink of moral corruption; and the flowing robes of the courtiers, their mincing feminine gait, their long hair parted in the middle, their fantastic shoes curled at the tip like horns of rams or tails of scorpions, fashions vehemently denounced by the writers of the time, were but the outward signs of nameless vice.

It was in his dealings with the Church that the blacker side of the Red King's character was manifested after the death of Lanfranc. The see of Canterbury was left vacant for nearly four years, in accordance with a policy devised by a crafty counsellor who was the king's evil genius. Randolph, or Ralph, surnamed Flambard (from the fiery energy with which he pushed his way up), was the son of a low-born priest in the diocese of Bayeux. The details of his early life are involved in obscurity. All that seems certain is that, having begun as a clerk of Maurice, Bishop of London, he obtained a menial situation in the court of William the Conqueror, and got on by his cleverness, making friends of ill-conditioned men by spending his money amongst them and sharing freely in their debaucheries, while to many of the nobles he became an object of terror and hatred by

Ralph Flambard.

acting as a kind of spy on their conduct, and laying information about them, true or false, before the king. Near the end probably of the Conqueror's reign, Ralph succeeded in obtaining the post of royal chaplain, and after the death of Lanfranc he became the confidential adviser of the Red King. His skilfulness in finance and law, together with his absolute unscrupulousness, made him particularly acceptable to his master, and he rose to a high official position which, although the language of contemporary writers is somewhat vague, appears to have been that of justiciar.

His methods of raising money.

Ralph was a consummate master of the art of squeezing money out of the king's subjects to fill the king's treasury. He was the only man, as Rufus used laughingly to say, who recked not of the hatred of others if only he pleased his employer. If an edict was issued for a tax of a certain amount, Ralph knew how to double it. But the master-stroke of his policy was that of organising certain feudal customs into a fixed system in the interest of the king. In the words of the English Chronicle, "the Red King would be made every man's heir," and Ralph contrived that his wish should be accomplished. The theory which he enforced was that all land belonged to the king; that the owner, lay or clerical, had only a life interest in it; that on his death it reverted to the king, who granted it out afresh, for which the new grantee had to make a payment. If the natural heir was under age, then, on the theory that every fief was held on condition of military service, which a minor clearly could not discharge, the king was to hold the fief and receive all the proceeds of the estate until the heir was old enough to buy it back and undertake the duties attached to it.

His oppression of the Church.

In the case of Church lands, on the death of an abbot or bishop, the property in like manner, on Ralph's theory, fell back to the king. But there was no heir, as in the case of a lay fief, for whom the king could even nominally act as guardian. The king, therefore, was the only heir; all the revenues of the vacant office fell into his hands, and he could keep it vacant as long as he pleased, which, in the case of Rufus, commonly meant until he was offered such a price for it as he thought worth accepting. This practice was a very startling innovation. The

old custom had been that, on the death of an abbot, the bishop of the diocese had an accurate inventory made of the property and effects of the house, and kept them under his own custody until a new head was appointed. In like manner, on the death of a bishop, the archbishop took charge of the property of the see and assigned the proceeds to the building of churches, the relief of the poor, or other good work, in such proportion as the officials of the see advised. Under Rufus, on the other hand, as soon as a prelate died, one of the king's clerks made a schedule of all the property and took possession of it in the king's name. Some of the lands were granted out for money or military service, or let for the highest rent that could be obtained; and when the new prelate was appointed he had commonly great difficulty in recovering them. In those cathedral churches where the episcopal and capitular estates were not separated, the king took the whole of the property on the death of the bishop, and assigned only a meagre pittance to the monks or canons. Ralph Flambard himself paid money to the king for the privilege of farming these confiscated Church estates. At one time he had as many as sixteen in his hands, and his oppression of the clergy and of the lay tenants was so great that they were wont to say it was better to die than to live under his tyranny.

Thus, in the pathetic words of the Chronicler, "God's Church was brought very low." The abbeys were generally kept vacant much longer than the bishoprics. The reason of the difference is obvious. Bishoprics, owing to the exalted position and power which they carried with them, were coveted by royal chaplains and ambitious men of that stamp, so that it was not difficult for the king to obtain his price for them. Abbotships could not be held by any but monks, who had not the same means at their command for buying the office. The abbeys consequently remained vacant a long time, until perhaps the monks could scrape enough money together to buy the right of electing an abbot for themselves. Moreover, the king cared less about appointments to abbeys than appointments to bishoprics. Abbots wielded less power than bishops, and were not brought into so much personal contact with the

Treatment of abbeys.

sovereign. There is a story told by the writer of the Hyde Chronicle which illustrates the king's indifference, and shows, if it is true, that he could sometimes resist a bribe and appoint a man on the strength of his merits. The abbot of an English house, not named, had died. Two of the monks, having each of them made up a large sum in gold and silver, obtained an audience of the king, and strove to outbid one another in their offers for the vacant post. They were accompanied by a third monk, who said nothing. After listening for some time to the rival candidates, the king turned to the silent brother and asked him what he wanted. "Nothing," was the reply; "he had only come to escort the abbot home with due honour." "Come hither, then," said the king, "and take the office thyself, for thou alone art worthy of it." The king enjoyed witnessing the disappointment of the two ambitious monks; the quiet brother reluctantly accepted the office, but ruled the house wisely and vigorously for many years.

During the vacancy of the archbishopric the church which Bishop Remigius had reared upon the lordly hill of Lincoln was finished. He felt that his end was drawing near, and he wished to have his cathedral consecrated before he died. Thomas, Archbishop of York, renewed his claim to exercise metropolitan jurisdiction, not, indeed, over the whole diocese which stretched to the Thames, but over the district of Lindsey, in which the city of Lincoln stood. And this he did on the ground that Lindsey had originally been evangelised by Paulinus, and had formed part of his Northumbrian diocese. Remigius is said to have secured the king's rejection of the claim by a present of money, and a royal command was issued that all the bishops in England should attend the ceremony of consecration on May 5, 1092. Remigius, however, died three days before that date. By his zeal in preaching, especially, like Wulfstan of Worcester, against the sin of slave-dealing, he had won the respect of his diocese, and after his death he was venerated as a saint, and the customary wonders of healing were performed at his tomb. The only survivals of his minster are the great doorways in the west front of the present church.

Remigius, Bp. of Lincoln, dies 1092.

The see of Chichester, which became vacant in 1088 by

the death of Bishop Gosfrid, was not filled up for more than two years. It was then bestowed on Ralph Luffa, who proved himself a man of such exceptionally high character that one can hardly suppose he obtained the office by bribery.

Ralph Luffa, Bp. of Chichester.

On the other hand, the see of Thetford, which fell vacant in 1091, was promptly bought for a thousand pounds by a Norman, Herbert Losinga, formerly a priest at Fécamp, and at this time Abbot of Ramsey. He also bought at the same time for his father the abbotship of the New Minster at Winchester, which had been kept vacant three years. This double act of simony excited public indignation, and Herbert himself was presently seized with shame and remorse. He betook himself to Rome in 1094, confessed his sin to the pope, and surrendered his bishopric to him. The pope, however, granted him absolution, and reinvested him with the episcopal staff, which he had originally received at the king's hands. He had met the king on his way out at Hastings, and had persisted in his journey to Rome against the king's will and without his license. Such a proceeding, together with submission to the Pope Urban II., whom the king had not acknowledged, and restoration to his bishopric by the sole authority of the pope, was quite contrary to ancient custom in England, and constituted a series of offences not easily forgiven. A few years later, however, he had regained the royal favour, and meanwhile the see of Thetford was shifted to Norwich, where Herbert built the cathedral, which in its main substance abides to this day, a noble memorial of his energy.

Herbert Losinga buys the see of Thetford.

AUTHORITIES.—*General:* Flor. of Worc., *Chron. Petrib.*, *Chron. de Bello;* Will. of Malmesb., *Gesta Reg.* and *Gesta Pontiff.;* Orderic Vital.; Henry of Huntingdon. *Special:* for history of William of St. Calais, *Simeon of Durham*, i. 119, etc.; Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* i. (Rolls series); *Monast. Angl. Dugdale*, i. 245, etc.; Bp. Stubbs's *Const. Hist.* ch. xi.; Freeman's *Will. Rufus*, i. 119, etc.: for history of Ralph Flambard, Orderic Vital. iii. 313, viii. 8, x. 18, xi. 31; *Simeon of Durham and his Continuators;* Letters of Anselm in Migne's *Patrologia Lat.* clix. coll. 201; Letters of Ivo of Chartres, *ibid.* clxii. coll. 162; Freeman's *Norm. Conq.* v. 131-134; *Will. Rufus*, i. 329, sqq.

CHAPTER V

ANSELM AND WILLIAM RUFUS

THE see of Lincoln was kept vacant for two years, but the unrighteous treatment of this, and all the minor sees, was a trifling offence compared with the prolonged vacancy of the metropolitan see of Canterbury. For an Archbishop of Canterbury was not merely the head of the English hierarchy. He was expected to be the chief counsellor of the sovereign, the moral guardian of the nation. The king was probably unwilling to fill the vacancy, not only because the revenues of the see enriched his coffers, but also because he did not wish to have a keeper of his conscience by his side to rebuke and restrain his vicious life and his unrighteous rule. Even he, it seems, did not dare to appoint a thoroughly bad man—a mere creature of his wicked will, like Ralph Flambard—to so high and holy an office; nor did he wish to have a good man in such a powerful position. And so, from a combination of motives, the primacy was kept vacant. No attempt was made to elect an archbishop, either by the great council of the realm or by the chapter of Canterbury. Either it was felt that such an attempt would have been fruitless, or the prescriptive right of the sovereign to nominate was so generally acknowledged, that no one dreamed of interfering with it. The national conscience was shocked, good men mourned and murmured, but nothing was done. An unforeseen occurrence at last provided an opportunity for action, and, by a strange coincidence, the holiest and most learned prelate that ever occupied the see of Canterbury was appointed by the most wicked king that ever sat upon the English throne.

Depressed state of the Church.

Anselm was born at Aosta in 1033, two years before William the Conqueror became Duke of Normandy. His birthplace, the ancient Augusta Salassorum, is situated in a narrow valley hemmed in by the giant Alps. The Roman walls still remain almost intact, and the street which perpetuates the name of Anselm runs between the Roman gate and the Roman arch of triumph. Anselm's parents were well born (his mother, perhaps, was connected with the princely house of Savoy), and they held considerable property under the Counts of Maurienne. The solitary anecdote of Anselm's early childhood bears the impress of the scenery by which he was surrounded. He imagined that heaven rested upon the mountain tops; and he dreamed one day that he climbed the mountain-side until he reached the palace of the great King, and there, having reported to him the idleness of his handmaidens, whom he had passed slothfully and lazily reaping their Master's corn in the valley, he was refreshed by the steward of the divine household with bread of heavenly purity and whiteness.

Early life of Anselm.

From an early age Anselm was studious as well as clever and amiable. He made rapid progress in learning, and grew up loving and beloved. Before he was fifteen, having become persuaded that there was nothing in the ways of men better than the life of monks, he went to a certain abbot whom he knew, and begged to be made a monk. The abbot, however, finding that the request was made without his father's knowledge, refused to grant it. The boy then prayed for an illness, hoping that his father might then be induced to yield to his wishes. The sickness came, and, having sent for the abbot, Anselm implored him, as one about to die, to make him a monk without delay. But the abbot, dreading the displeasure of Anselm's father, still refused, and the lad recovered. A period of reaction followed: his longing for the religious life, and even his ardour for study, cooled; he began to devote himself rather to youthful sport, and after the death of his mother, who was a deeply devout as well as sensible woman, he became like a ship parted from its anchor, and drifted more completely into worldly ways. Some passages in one of his *Meditations* (xvi.) would, if literally interpreted, imply that he fell into very serious sin; but there is some doubt

whether he is speaking in his own person, and even if he is, the language may be only the reproaches, rhetorically expressed, of a highly sensitive conscience. For some reason not explained, his father took a strong dislike to him, which Anselm's meekness and submission seemed rather to inflame than soften.

At last in despair, when he was about twenty-three years of age, Anselm resolved to quit his home and seek his fortune in some other land. He set out northwards, accompanied by a single clerk. After spending nearly three years in Burgundy and France (but at what places we are not informed), he made his way to Normandy, attracted by the fame of Lanfranc, who had now become prior of the house at Bec. His school there was at the height of its reputation and prosperity. Students flocked to it from all parts of Europe, and the great men of Normandy lavished gifts upon it. Anselm threw himself heartily into the work of the place. The severity of his studies, and the ascetic mode of living at Bec, were almost too much for his delicate frame; but he was persuaded that the moral discipline was good for his soul, and his longing to become a monk grew stronger. But if he became a monk, whither was he to go? If to Cluny, he thought the time he had spent in learning would be wasted owing to the excessive rigour of the rule there; if he stayed on at Bec, he thought in his humility that his learning would be so entirely overshadowed by the superior learning of Lanfranc as to be of little use. Meanwhile, by the death of his father he became owner of the family property. Three courses then presented themselves to him for his choice: he might settle at Bec, or he might become a hermit, or he might return to his native home and administer his patrimony for the benefit of the poor. He took counsel with Lanfranc, who advised him to consult Maurilius, Archbishop of Rouen, and accompanied him on a visit to that prelate. Maurilius decided in favour of the monastic life, and so in 1060 Anselm took the cowl and remained at Bec.

Anselm quits his home.

He arrives at Bec.

Three years afterwards Lanfranc was made abbot of the new house of St. Stephen at Caen, and Anselm succeeded him in the office of prior at Bec. He

He is first made prior, then abbot.

held this post for fifteen years, 1063-1078. Then Herluin, the founder and abbot, died, and for fifteen years more, 1078-1093, Anselm ruled the house as abbot.

It was during this period of thirty years that his powers were fully developed. If Lanfranc had commanding talents, Anselm had lofty genius. Both morally and intellectually his character was of a finer type. He had not only more tenderness, more breadth of sympathy, more transparent honesty and simplicity of purpose, but far profounder and more original powers of thought, which enabled him to grapple with some of the most intricate and, before his time, unsolved questions touching the nature of God, and the relations between God and man. A large part of Anselm's time by day was often consumed in giving advice, orally or by letter, to persons, many of them of high rank, who consulted him on questions of faith or conduct, and the remainder of his time between the hours of prayer, including a great part of the night, was devoted to study, meditation, and correcting the books of the monastery. He did not shrink even from the drudgery of instructing boys in the rudiments of grammar, although he owned that he found this an irksome task (Epist. i. 55). But the work in which he most delighted and excelled was that of moulding the minds and character of young men. For this he was eminently fitted by his sweetness of temper and affectionate sympathy, his playful humour, his deep piety and powerful intellect, his acuteness in discerning character, and his practical wisdom in suggesting rules for moral conduct. His good sense in the management of children is illustrated by the advice which he gave to an abbot who complained of the difficulty of training the boys in his monastery. They were incorrigibly perverse, he said, and although constantly beaten, they only grew worse. "Beat them, do you?" said Anselm, "and pray, what kind of creatures are they when they grow up?" "Dull and brutal," was the reply. "Verily," said Anselm, "you are unfortunate if you only succeed in turning human beings into beasts." "But what can we do?" rejoined the abbot, "we restrain them in every possible way, but all to no purpose." "Restrain them, my lord abbot! If you planted a young shoot in your garden and then confined it on all sides, so that it could not put

His character and work.

forth its branches, would it not turn out a strange misshapen thing when at last it was set free, and all from your own fault! Even so, these children have been planted in the garden of the Church, to grow and bear fruit for God; but you cramp them so severely with your punishments and threats, that they contract all manner of evil tempers and sullenly resent all correction." After more plain speaking of this kind, the abbot was brought to confess that his method of training had been all wrong, and he promised that he would try and amend it. Notwithstanding his wonderful gifts of personal influence, Anselm shrank with extreme reluctance from the responsibility of high office. When he was unanimously elected Abbot of Bec, he passionately entreated the brethren to spare him; and it was only in deference to their persistency and the authority of the Archbishop of Rouen, that he yielded at last. As abbot, he gave up most of the secular business of the house to such of the brethren as he could trust, and devoted himself as far as possible to study, meditation, and educational work. Nevertheless, if the house was involved in any lawsuit of importance, he took care to be present in court in order to prevent any chicanery being practised by his own party. If their opponents resorted to craft and sophistry, he heeded not, but either went to sleep or occupied his time in discussing some question in ethics, or some passage in Scripture with his companions. Yet, if the cunning pleadings of the contending party were submitted to his judgment, he speedily detected the flaws in their reasoning, and tore their argument to pieces.

His first visit to England, 1078.

Occasionally he was obliged to visit the property of the house in various parts of Normany and Flanders. These journeys brought him into contact with persons of all ranks and conditions, with the result that many gave themselves and their property to the monastery; but he would never accept any personal gift. His first visit to England was paid in 1078, soon after he became abbot. He came not only to look after the English possessions of the abbey, but also to see his friend, Lanfranc the primate. He was received with great honour at Canterbury, and charmed the brethren of Christchurch by his eloquent addresses, delivered daily in the chapter-house or cloister upon topics

connected with monastic life. With the more learned and intellectual monks he discoursed privately upon deep questions in philosophy and religion. Here began his acquaintance with Eadmer, a youthful brother, who became his devoted friend, and to whom we are indebted for the record of his life.

It was on this occasion also that the doubts of Lanfranc respecting the claim of Archbishop Ælfheah to martyrdom were removed by the more large-minded views and reasoning of Anselm.[1]

As he made his progress through England, visiting the various estates of his abbey, he was lodged sometimes in monastic houses, sometimes in the dwellings of noblemen. Wherever he went he was a welcome guest, for he had the happy art of adapting his conversation to the needs and understanding of all with whom he came in contact—monks, nuns, clerks, laymen, women married and unmarried, learned and unlearned folk. For scholar and theologian as he was, he conveyed most of his teaching through the medium of homely illustrations and familiar instances, which impressed his hearers all the more because the method was not a common one with learned teachers in that age. His society, therefore, was prized, his advice and instruction eagerly sought by persons of all ranks and conditions; and it is specially recorded that William the Conqueror, who seemed to most men stern and formidable, was so mild and gentle in the presence of Anselm that he seemed to be turned into another man. When he lay dying of his death-wound in the Abbey of St. Gervase at Rouen, he sent for Anselm to hear the confession of his burdened conscience. Anselm came from Bec. The king, however, hoping that he should get better, put off seeing him for a few days. Meanwhile Anselm himself fell ill. William daily sent to him some of the delicacies which were provided for himself, but neither was able to visit the other, and the king died without the benefit and comfort of Anselm's ministrations.

William the Conqueror's esteem for him.

In 1092, when the see of Canterbury had been kept vacant nearly three years, Hugh of Avranches, Earl of Chester, invited Anselm to come and assist him in the work of

[1] See above, p. 63.

substituting monks for canons in the minster of St. Werburgh at Chester. Anselm, however, having heard that popular rumour marked him out for the primacy, feared that the motive of his visit might be misconstrued, and therefore declined to come. At last he yielded to the urgent entreaties of the earl, who said that he was mortally ill, and that if Anselm did not come he might regret in another world having refused to hearken to the request of a dying friend. Many other noblemen in England who had made him their spiritual adviser were also urging him to pay them a visit, and the Chapter of Bec were anxious that he should try, by personal pleading with the Red King, to get the oppressive exactions which were levied upon their English property lightened.

He visits Hugh, Earl of Chester, 1092.

So Anselm set sail from Boulogne, where he had been staying with the Countess Ida, and reached Canterbury on September 8, the eve of the Nativity of the Virgin; but being hailed by monks and laymen as their future archbishop he hurried away early the next morning, refusing even to tarry for the celebration of the festival.

On his way to Chester he visited the Court, where he was received with great honour, even by the king himself, who rose to greet him, gave him the kiss of peace, and led him by the right hand to a seat by the side of his own. After they had conversed pleasantly together for some time Anselm requested the favour of a private interview, in which he talked very plainly and seriously to the king about the iniquities of his life, and his oppressive treatment of the Church. William forbore from insulting his monitor, in consideration, it is said, of the great respect that he knew his parents had entertained for him. He seems to have turned the subject off with a laugh, saying that he could not prevent idle rumours, and that the holy man ought not to believe them. So they parted, and Anselm went on his way.

His meeting with the Red King.

On his arrival at Chester he found that Earl Hugh had recovered from his illness. After spending five months partly in settling the new constitution of St. Werburgh's minster, partly in visiting the English possessions of Bec, he proposed to return to Normandy; but the king would not give him license to leave

He arrives at Chester.

What the motive of his refusal may have been it is not easy to conjecture; but it is possible that, knowing how popular rumour marked out Anselm for the primacy, he may have thought, in the baseness of his soul, that Anselm desired it, and have hoped that even he might be induced to offer some price for it.

The midwinter council was held at Gloucester, and after the council the king went to sojourn at Alvestone, a royal dwelling near Gloucester. Here one of his nobles talked one day of the virtues of Anselm, how he was a man who loved God only, and coveted nothing belonging to this transient world. "Not even the archbishopric?" said William with a sneer. "No, not even that," replied the other, "and many think with me." The king, however, maintained that Anselm would rush to embrace it if he had the chance; "but, by the holy face of Lucca," he said, "neither he nor any one shall be archbishop at present, except myself." Council at Gloucester.

Soon after this the king was taken very ill, and was moved to Gloucester. The bishops, lay nobles, and other great men visited the sick and, as they thought, dying king, and urged him to redress the wrongs which he had inflicted on the nation, and especially on the Church. The king's illness. But they felt the need of some one at this critical moment who had special skill in awakening the conscience and ministering to the diseases of the soul. There was no one comparable to Anselm, and he, unconscious of the king's illness, happened to be staying not far from Gloucester. He was fetched with all speed. Having heard and approved of the advice already given to the king, the saint was brought to the bedside of the royal sinner. He bade him make a clean confession of his misdeeds, together with a solemn promise of amendment should he recover.

The confession was made, and all manner of reforms, civil and ecclesiastical, were promised: prisoners should be released, debts should be cancelled, widowed churches should be provided with pastors, law should be observed, wrongs should be investigated and redressed. In short, a kind of charter of good government was issued. His promises of reform. Thanksgivings to God were offered throughout the land that

the king had been brought to a better mind, and prayers were offered up for his recovery. The repentance was at the time sincere, and some of the reforms were actually effected; grants of land were made to various monastic houses, and the vacant see of Lincoln was bestowed on the king's chancellor, Robert Bloet, a man of experience and skill in secular affairs, and, though not a scholar and still less a saint, yet by no means such a sinner as some unfriendly Chroniclers have represented him.

He names Anslem for the primacy.

The great men of the realm urged upon the king the paramount duty of filling up the metropolitan see, which had now been vacant four years. The king intimated his willingness. He was asked to name the man whom he deemed worthy of the high office. Raising himself on one arm in the bed, he pointed to Anslem, who was present, and said, "I choose yonder holy man." A shout of joy rang through the room. To Anselm it sounded as the death-knell of happiness. He trembled and turned pale, and when the bishops would have led him to the king to receive the pastoral staff at his hands, he resisted with all his might. The bishops took him aside and remonstrated with him. Would he strive against God? Christianity had well-nigh perished in England, all was in confusion, abominations of all kinds prevailed everywhere, they themselves and their churches were brought into peril of eternal death through the tyranny of yonder man (the king), and would Anselm disdain to succour them? In the oppression of the Church of Canterbury they were all oppressed, they besought him to deliver them, and not to prefer his own ease to their salvation. In reply, Anselm pleaded that he was an old man, and that ever since he became a monk he had shunned worldly business. He entreated them to suffer him to dwell in peace, and not to entangle him in labours for which he had no capacity and no liking. The bishops said if he accepted the primacy, all they would ask him to do would be to precede and direct them in the way of God. If he would pray to God for them, they would administer his secular business for him. But he was still inexorable; he was the subject, he said, of another ruler, and he owed allegiance not only to the Duke of Normandy, but also to the Arch-

Anselm's resistance.

bishop of Rouen, and the chapter of his own abbey. These pleas, however, were all made light of; he was dragged to the bedside of the king, who besought him by his friendship for his father and mother to yield to the general wish, and not to endanger the salvation of their son. Anselm still resisted, and the bishops began to be angry. What madness had seized him? He was vexing the king, and embittering his last moments by his obstinacy. He would be answerable for all the evils that would follow if he refused to prevent them by accepting the office of chief pastor.

In his distress, Anselm turned for support to two of his own monks, Baldwin and Eustace, who had accompanied him from Bec, saying, that if it were the will of God he would rather die than accept the archbishopric; but Baldwin with a passionate burst of tears, could only counsel submission to the will of God. At the bidding of the king, the bishops prostrated themselves before Anselm, imploring him to yield, but he in turn fell down before them and remained obdurate. Then they lost patience. They called for a pastoral staff, and partly pushed, partly dragged him once more to the king's bedside. The king presented the staff; the bishops held out Anselm's right arm to take it, but he kept his hand tightly clenched; they tried to force it open until he cried aloud with the pain. At last they had to content themselves with placing the staff against his clenched fist, and holding it there with their own hands. Then, while the people shouted "long live the bishop," and the clergy sang "Te Deum," he was carried rather than led into a neighbouring church, he still resisting as far as he could, and crying out "it is nought that ye are doing, it is nought that ye are doing." "It would have been difficult," he says in a letter to the monks at Bec (Ep. iii. 1), "for a looker-on to say whether a sane man was being dragged by a crowd of madmen, or whether sane men were dragging a madman along." After some kind of ceremony in the Church, Anselm returned to the king and renewed his protest in the form of a prophecy. "I tell thee, my lord king, that thou wilt not die of this sickness; therefore thou mayest undo what thou hast done concerning me, for I have not consented, neither do I now consent to its being ratified."

The pastoral staff forced upon him.

Then, as he left the chamber, he turned to the bishops and told them they did not know what they were doing; they were yoking an untamed bull with a weak old sheep to draw the plough of the Church, which ought to be drawn by two strong steers. Such had been the king's father and the primate Lanfranc. Then there had been a union of righteous government in secular things, with sound teaching and wise rule in spiritual things. Now, the untameable ferocity of the bull would drag the poor old sheep through thorns and thistles, lacerating it and rendering it useless. Then the Church which they were so anxious to succour would relapse into its former miserable condition. They would not have the courage to stand by him against the king, and the king after he had crushed him would trample them also under his feet. He then burst into tears, and faint with fatigue and distress, retired to his lodgings.

We should be doing Anselm injustice if we imagined that there was anything overstrained or affected in his resistance, strange as it may seem. A great show of reluctance to accept a bishopric was indeed expected of a monk as a matter of course, and was no doubt sometimes merely conventional: but Anselm was a genuine monk to the heart's core, really devoted to the life of study and religious seclusion. The consent of Robert, Duke of Normandy, and of the Archbishop of Rouen, to his appointment was easily obtained; but the monks of Bec were naturally very reluctant to part with their beloved and illustrious abbot, and it was only after a long debate and by a very narrow majority that they acquiesced.

Meanwhile the Red King recovered from his sickness, and repented of his repentance. His last state was worse than the first, and the ill that he had done before seemed good in comparison with the evil that he did now. The memory of his illness hardened instead of softening him; he bitterly resented it, and when Bishop Gundulf remonstrated with him for his evil ways, he impiously swore by his favourite oath, the holy face of Lucca, "God shall never have me good in return for the ill that He has brought on me." He did not, however, revoke his nomination of Anselm.

The king recovers.

In the course of the summer of 1093 the king met

Anselm at Rochester. Anselm told him that he was still hesitating whether he would accept the archbishopric, but if he did it must be on three conditions: (i.) That all the lands belonging to the see in the time of Lanfranc should be restored without any dispute or litigation; (ii.) that the king should see justice done in respect of lands upon which the see had a long standing claim; (iii.) that in matters pertaining to God the king should take him for his counsellor and spiritual father, as he on his part would acknowledge the king as his earthly lord. Another point on which he wished his position to be clearly understood had reference to the two rival claimants to the papacy. Clement the anti-pope had been set up by the Emperor Henry IV. in opposition to Hildebrand (Gregory VII.). Urban had been elected by the cardinals in the place of Victor, the short-lived successor of Gregory. France and Normandy had pronounced in favour of Urban. In England public opinion had hesitated between the two, but on the whole, through fear of the king, inclined to the side of Clement. Anselm now told the king that he himself was committed to the side of Urban, whom he had acknowledged in common with the whole Norman Church. The king took counsel with Count Robert of Meulan and the Bishop of Durham, William of St. Calais. He asked Anselm to repeat his statements in the hearing of these counsellors, and after conferring with them he replied that he would restore all the lands that had belonged to the see in the time of Lanfranc, but upon the other points he should reserve his jugdment.

He meets Anselm at Rochester.

A few days afterwards the king summoned Anselm to Windsor, and begged him to accept the primacy, to which he was called by the choice of the whole realm. With this request, however, the king coupled another, which started a fresh difficulty. Certain lands held of the archiepiscopal see by some English thegns before the Norman Conquest had, during the episcopate of Lanfranc, lapsed for lack of heirs to the archbishop as lord. During the vacancy of the see the Red King had granted them out as military fiefs, and he now summoned Anselm into the king's court in order that this arrangement might be made permanent. But Anselm refused. He had no right, he thought, to

They meet again at Windsor.

accept the archbishopric on such terms, which would have inflicted a wrong on the church. The king was so much irritated by the refusal that Anselm began to hope he might after all escape the burden which he so much dreaded.

Anselm accepts the primacy.

This, however, was not to be. The whole nation was enraged by the king's relapse into evil courses, and was determined to force him if possible to a renewal of the promises that he had made during his illness at Gloucester. A special council was held for this purpose at Winchester, in which the king solemnly renewed his pledges. Anselm was now at last persuaded to accept the archbishopric, and did homage according to custom for the lands of the see. The saint knelt down, and placing his hands between the hands of the royal sinner, acknowledged him as his territorial lord. The royal writ was issued, setting forth that the king had bestowed the archbishopric on Anselm, with all the rights, powers, and possessions belonging to the see, and with all liberties over all his men, and over as many thegns as King Eadward had granted to the Church. These last words seem to imply that the point disputed at Windsor was conceded in Anselm's favour. The question of the rival claimants to the papacy does not seem to have been brought up at the Winchester council. Anselm perhaps thought it wiser not to press it, and that the king would be more likely to acknowledge Urban if he was not urged to do it.

Anselm enthroned and consecrated.

Anselm was enthroned in Canterbury Cathedral, September 25, 1093, in the presence of a rejoicing multitude. On December 4, he was consecrated by Thomas, Archbishop of York, assisted by all the bishops of the southern province except Wulfstan of Worcester, Herbert of Thetford, and Osbern of Exeter, who signified their assent by letter. Before the consecration Walkelin of Winchester, at the request of the Bishop of London, the Dean of the province of Canterbury, read the formal record of the appointment. When he came to the words, "the Metropolitan of all Britain," the Archbishop of York interrupted, exclaiming "Metropolitan of all Britain! Then is the church of York, which all men know to be metropolitan, not metropolitan?" The objection was allowed, and the term "Primate

of all Britain" was substituted for "Metropolitan." Anselm made profession of obedience to the Roman pontiff, but there was a prudent reticence as to his name.

On the day after the consecration, the Archbishop of York made another attempt to claim jurisdiction over the see of Lincoln. He warned Anselm to abandon his intention of consecrating Robert Bloet to that see. He might consecrate him to the old see of Dorchester, but Thomas maintained that Lincoln and a great part of Lindsey were within the limits of the province of York. The question was allowed to remain in abeyance for a time, but the claim was not considered valid, and after two months Robert was consecrated at Hastings by Anselm, assisted by seven other bishops, including William of Durham.

Anselm remained at Canterbury for eight days after his consecration, and then proceeded to Gloucester, where the king was keeping court, preparatory to holding the Christmas council. The new archbishop was graciously received by the king, and warmly welcomed by all the nobility of the realm. At this council a hostile message from Robert, Duke of Normandy, was considered, and war was declared. As usual the great need was money. The chief men offered their contributions, and Anselm offered 500 pounds of silver. The king accepted the gift with a good grace, but some malignant persons suggested to him that he ought to have received £2000 or at the least £1000; and a message was then sent to Anselm that his offer was rejected. He sought an audience with the king, and entreated him to take the contribution which, although his first, would not be his last. A free gift, however small, was far more valuable than one forcibly exacted. The king felt that this remark was directed against his extortionate methods of raising money, and he angrily replied: "Keep your scolding and your money to yourself. I have enough of my own: Begone." Anselm departed. The words of the gospel read on the day of his enthronement, "No man can serve two masters," came home to his mind, and he was thankful that after all the gift had been refused, for no one could now insinuate that it was a preconcerted price for the archbishopric. He was urged to offer double the sum, but steadfastly refused,

The king quarrels with Anselm.

and expended his despised present on the poor, for the redemption, as he said, of the king's soul.

They meet at Hastings.

On February 2, 1094, the forces destined for the invasion of Normandy were mustered at Hastings. Anselm and other bishops were summoned thither to invoke a blessing on the expedition. The passage of the army was delayed for more than a month by contrary winds. During this interval, on February 11, Anselm, assisted by seven bishops, consecrated the church of the great abbey founded by the Conqueror at Battle. Thus in one religious act, at least, the two unequal yoke-fellows, the fierce bull and the gentle sheep, Anselm the saint and William the sinner, were united.

On the first day of Lent Anselm presided at the ceremony of sprinkling ashes, and preached a sermon, in the course of which he rebuked the young courtiers for their mincing gait, their effeminate dress and fashions, especially that of wearing their hair long. He refused to give the ashes of penitence, or administer absolution to those who would not abandon these fashions.

Anselm preaches reform.

In one of the daily interviews which Anselm seems to have had with William at Hastings, he frankly told him that if he would hope for a blessing upon his expedition to Normandy, or any other enterprise, he must aid in re-establishing Christianity, which had well nigh perished out of the land. He therefore asked leave to hold a national synod of bishops, which was a time-honoured remedy in England and Normandy for ecclesiastical and moral evils. William replied that he would call a council at his own pleasure, not Anselm's. "And pray," said he with a sneer, "what will you talk about in your council?" "The sin of Sodom," answered Anselm, "not to speak of other detestable vices that have become rampant in the land. Let us endeavour together, thou by thy royal power, and I by my pontifical authority, to extirpate this monstrous growth of evil." But the heart of the Red King was hardened, and he only asked, "And what good will come of this matter for thee?" "For me perhaps nothing," replied Anselm, "but something I hope for God and for thyself." "Enough," rejoined the king, "speak no more on this subject." Anselm obeyed, but

turned to another scandal, the prolonged vacancies in the abbeys. This touched the king in two of his tenderest points, his greed of money and his royal privileges. "What," he burst forth, "are the abbeys to you? Are they not mine? Shall you deal as you like with your manors, and shall I not deal as I choose with my abbeys?" "The abbeys," rejoined Anselm, "are yours to protect as their advocate, not to waste and destroy. They belong to God, and their revenues are intended for the support of His ministers, not of your wars." "Your words are highly offensive to me," said the king, "your predecessor would never have dared to speak thus to my father. I will do nothing for you." The king's anger.

So Anselm, seeing that his words were cast to the winds, rose up and went his way. But he was deeply vexed at this loss of the royal favour, because he felt that without it he could not accomplish the reforms which he had at heart. He sent the bishops to the king to beg that he would take him into his friendship again, or at least say why he refused it. The bishops returned, saying that the king did not accuse Anselm of anything, but would not show him any favour, because "he heard not wherefore he should." Anselm inquired what the latter words meant. "The mystery," replied the bishops, "is plain. If you want peace with him you must give him plenty of money. Renew your offer of the £500 which he refused, and promise him as much again, to be raised from your tenants.

Anselm indignantly rejected this proposal. His tenants had been plundered and spoiled after the death of Lanfranc, and now that they were bare, should he fleece and flay them? He owed the king fealty and honour, and he would not degrade the king or himself by buying his favour for so much money, as he would buy a horse or an ass. Let the bishops do their best to induce the king to love him freely and honestly as being archbishop and his spiritual father, and he on his part would endeavour to render him the service and goodwill that were due to him. His words were reported to the king, who sent back as his answer, "Yesterday I hated him much, to-day I hate him more, and to-morrow and henceforth I shall hate him with Anselm quits the court.

ever bitterer hatred. I will no longer hold him as father and archbishop, and I utterly repudiate his blessing and his prayers. Let him go where he will, and not tarry any longer to bless my voyage." "We therefore left the court with all speed," says Eadmer, who became from this time his constant companion, "and abandoned the king to his will." William crossed at length to Normandy about the middle of March. Having spent much and gained little in his campaign, he returned to England on December 28, 1094.

Bishop Wulfstan dies, 1095.

On the 18th of the following month Wulfstan, the aged Bishop of Worcester, who had been in failing health for many months, entered into his rest. Appointed in the reign of Eadward the Confessor, he was the last link surviving in the episcopate of the old English stock and the days before the Norman Conquest. He was one of those purely good men who command universal respect. Irish kings, we are told, honoured him with great favours. The King and Queen of Scotland, Malcolm and Margaret, commended themselves to his prayers; he numbered amongst his correspondents Pope Urban, the Archbishop of Bari, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Even the Red King behaved respectfully to him. He had made his confession to his friend Robert, the learned Bishop of Hereford, at Whitsuntide 1094, when his end was supposed to be near, but he rallied and lived on to the end of the year. In January he confessed again, and passed the few days remaining to him in devotional exercises, having placed his seat in his chamber so as to command a view of the altar in his chapel. He was buried in the choir of his cathedral, and became a favourite local saint, although never formally canonised.

Anselm wishes to fetch his pall.

To return to the story of Anselm. He had been a full year in office without having received the pall, which was regarded as an indispensable badge of metropolitan authority, although not actually essential to the validity of an archbishop's spiritual function. Some time, therefore, in February 1095 Anselm went to Gillingham, near Shaftesbury, where the king was keeping court, and asked leave to go to Rome for his pall. William inquired from which of the two rival popes he intended to obtain it. "From Urban," was the reply; and he reminded the king of

the warning he had given him at Rochester, that he had when abbot of Bec promised obedience to Urban and could not recede from it. William, on the other hand, maintained that Anselm could not obey a pope against the king's will consistently with his allegiance to his sovereign. He himself had not yet acknowledged Urban, and it had not been his father's custom or his own to let any one in England acknowledge any one as pope without the royal permission. Anselm, on his part, felt that the king had no right to force him into renouncing a choice which had been made before he became a subject, and he rightly maintained that the question was one which could be settled only by the great council of the nation. He asked for such a council and the request was granted.

The assembly was convened on Sunday, February 25, at Rockingham, a royal hunting-seat and fortress on the borders of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. A crowd of bishops, abbots, nobles, monks, clerks, and laymen were collected at an early hour in the castle and precincts. The king with some of his leading courtiers sat in a separate chamber, and a messenger passed to and fro between them and the larger assembly, which seems to have been held either in the chapel of the castle or in the great hall which may have opened out of it.

Council at Rockingham, 1095.

Anselm himself opened the proceedings with an address; the bishops came from the royal presence-chamber to hear it. He explained the object of the meeting, which was to decide whether there was any incompatibility between his allegiance to the king and his obedience to Urban. He reminded the bishops how very unwilling he had been to accept the archbishopric; indeed, he would rather have been burned at the stake than have taken it; but he had yielded to their earnest entreaties, and now that he was in a difficulty he looked to them for the advice and support which they had promised to give him. The bishops, who appear throughout these transactions as timid and obsequious courtiers, replied that the archbishop was too wise and good a man to need advice from them, but in any case no advice could they give him unless he first of all submitted absolutely to the king's will. They reported his speech, how-

Anselm's address.

ever, to the king, who adjourned the proceedings to the morrow.

On Monday Anselm, sitting in the midst of the assembly, asked the bishops if they were now ready with their advice: but they had only the same answer to make. Then, with uplifted eyes and kindling countenance, he said, "Since you, the shepherds of the people, and ye who are called the leaders of the nation will give no counsel to me, your head, save according to the will of one man, I will betake me to the chief Shepherd, and Head of all, the Angel of great counsel, and will follow that which I shall receive from Him touching my cause, or rather His cause and that of His Church. He who declared that obedience was due to St. Peter and the other apostles, and through them to the bishops, saying, 'He that despiseth you despiseth me,' also taught that the things of Cæsar were to be rendered to Cæsar. By those words I will abide. In the things that are God's I will render obedience to the vicar of the Blessed Peter; in things touching the earthly dignity of my lord the king, I will to the best of my ability give him faithful counsel and help." The assembly rose in great consternation, and a confused hum of voices betrayed their agitation. The cowardly bishops could not gainsay the words of Anselm, but they were afraid to report them to the king. So Anselm went himself into the presence-chamber and repeated them in the audience of William, who was exceedingly wroth and consulted with the bishops and nobles concerning the answer to be given. Their perplexity was extreme. They broke up into small groups, each discussing how some answer might be framed. Anselm meanwhile having retired to the outer hall, rested his head against the wall and quietly went to sleep.

He appeals to the pope.

After a while he was roused by a party of bishops and lay lords bringing a message from the king. The king demanded an immediate decision respecting the question at issue, which needed no explanation. The bishops counselled Anselm to renounce his obedience to Urban and freely submit to the king's will in everything. Anselm replied that he would certainly not renounce his obedience to the pope, but as the day was far

The king demands submission.

advanced he asked leave to reserve his answer for the morrow. The bishops suspected that this meant he was wavering, or that he did not know what to say.

The crafty and unscrupulous William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham, who was the leader of the bishops on the king's side, now thought he would be able to drive Anselm into a corner. He boasted to the king that he would force the primate either to renounce obedience to the pope or to resign his episcopal staff and ring. This fell in with the king's wishes. He desired either to get rid of Anselm or to disgrace him. If he abjured Pope Urban he would remain in the kingdom a discredited man; if he adhered to him the king would expel him the kingdom.

So the Bishop of Durham, with a party of supporters, hastened back to Anselm and peremptorily demanded that he should reinvest the king with the imperial dignity of which he had robbed him in having made the Bishop of Ostia (Urban) pope in his kingdom without his authority. Anselm calmly replied: "If any one wishes to prove that I violate my allegiance to my earthly sovereign because I will not renounce my obedience to the sovereign pontiff of the Holy Roman Church, let him come forward, and he will find me ready in the name of the Lord to answer him *as I ought and where I ought.*" These last words disconcerted Bishop William and his friends, for they understood them to mean that as Archbishop of Canterbury he refused to be judged by any one save the pope himself, a doctrine which it seems no one was prepared to deny, least of all William of St. Calais, who had so recently insisted on the same right for himself.

The Bishop of Durham's plan.

On the morrow, Tuesday, Anselm once more took his seat, awaiting the king's message. The king's counsellors were perplexed; and even the Bishop of Durham had nothing to suggest but force. The staff and ring might be wrested from the primate and he himself expelled the kingdom. But this suggestion naturally did not please the lay lords; for it would have been an awkward precedent if the first vassal in the kingdom were deprived of his fief at the king's pleasure. William, in a rage, told them that he would brook no equal in his kingdom; if the

The king's advisers baffled.

proposal of the Bishop of Durham did not please them let them consult and say what would; for by the face of God he would condemn them if they would not condemn Anselm. Count Robert of Meulan then said, "As for our counsel, I own I know not what to say; for while we are considering plans all day, and how they may be made to hang together, the archbishop innocently goes to sleep, and then when they are presented to him he snaps them in pieces with one puff of his lips as if they were cobwebs." The king then turned to the bishops, but they had no suggestion to offer. Anselm was their primate, and they had no power to judge or condemn him, even had any crime been proved against him. The king then proposed that they should at least withdraw their obedience and brotherly fellowship from the archbishop. And to this mean suggestion they had the baseness to assent. Accompanied by some abbots they announced their intention to Anselm, and informed him that the king also withdrew his protection and trust, and would no longer hold him for archbishop or spiritual father. Anselm mildly replied that they did ill to withdraw their allegiance from him because he refused to withdraw his own from the successor of the chief of the apostles. The king might withdraw all protection from him, but he would not cease to care for the king's soul; retaining the title, power, and office of archbishop, whatever oppression it might be his lot to suffer.

The Red King now tried to make the lay lords abandon the primate, saying "no one shall be my man who chooses to be his;" to which the nobles replied that as they never were the archbishop's men they had no fealty to withdraw: "nevertheless," they said, "he is our archbishop; he has the direction of christianity in this land, and in this respect we cannot, whilst we live here, as christians refuse his guidance, especially as he has not been guilty of any offence that should compel us to act otherwise." The king dissembled his wrath, for he was afraid of offending the nobles, whose manly utterance put the craven conduct of the bishops in a more odious light. These wretched time-servers were now generally reprobated, and many of them were called by opprobrious names—Judas, Pilate, Herod, and the like. The king tightened his grip upon them by requiring an

Lay lords will not help the king.

40442

unconditional renunciation of their obedience to Anselm, and squeezing more money out of them to buy his favour. Anselm meanwhile requested leave to quit the kingdom and a safe-conduct to one of the seaports.

William heartily wished to be rid of him, but did not wish him to go while seised of the archbishopric, yet saw no way to disseise him of it. In this dilemma the nobles proposed a truce and an adjournment of the whole question to the octave of Whitsuntide. To this proposal, which was made on the fourth day of the meeting, the king and Anselm assented. Thus ended the famous council of Rockingham. It seemed to come to nothing, but in reality a great moral victory had been gained; malignity, spite, selfishness, cunning had been arrayed against simple purity and uprightness of purpose, and had been completely baffled.

A truce agreed upon.

The Red King kept the letter of the truce with Anselm, but vented his spite by attacking his friends. He expelled Baldwin of Tournay, a monk of Bec, one of the archbishop's most devoted and trusted friends, and two of his clerks from the kingdom; he arrested his chamberlain, and worried his tenants by unjust lawsuits and imposts. His next device was to gain the pope over to his side. He secretly despatched two clerks of the chapel royal (Gerard, afterwards Archbishop of York, and William of Warelwast, a future Bishop of Exeter) to Italy; first, to ascertain which was the real pope; secondly, to persuade him to send the pall to the king, suppressing the name of the archbishop, so that he might be able to bestow it on any one he pleased, should he succeed in getting rid of Anselm.

Rufus sends messengers to Rome.

The envoys had no difficulty in discovering that Urban was the pope in possession. They acknowledged him in the name of the king, and obtained their request. Cardinal Walter, Bishop of Albano, returned with them to England, bringing the pall. The journey was made with all speed in order to reach England before Whitsuntide, great secrecy also being observed. The legate was not allowed to converse with any one except in the presence of the envoys, and on reaching England he was hurried to the court without being permitted to tarry in

A cardinal brings the pall.

Lincoln Christian College

Canterbury or communicate with Anselm. Shortly before Whitsuntide he had an interview with the king. What took place is not recorded, but it was understood that William was encouraged to hope that his wishes would be granted, and that the legate had not uttered a word on Anselm's behalf. This excited great indignation amongst those who had hoped much from the intervention of the pope. "If," they said, "Rome prefers gold and silver to justice, what support, what counsel, what comfort under oppression may be looked for henceforth by those who have nothing to give to secure right being done." The king now ordered a formal recognition of Urban as pope to be published in his dominions, and then asked the legate that Anselm might be deposed by papal authority, promising a large annual payment to the papal court if his request was granted. But he had overshot his mark. The cardinal told him plainly that such a compact was out of the question.

Urban acknowledged as pope.

Meanwhile the bishops visited Anselm at his manor of Hayes, near Windsor, and tried to induce him to render submission to the king in return for the gift of the pall, or at least to pay such a sum as the journey to Rome would have cost him had he gone to fetch it himself. The king had saved him all the trouble and expense—what would he give in return? Anselm indignantly rejected their proposals. "I will not give him anything, or do anything for him on this account: your efforts are vain; desist."

Thus far William had gained nothing and lost much by his dealing with Rome. He had acknowledged Urban, whom Anselm had acknowledged long ago, he had neither got rid of the archbishop nor induced him to surrender, nor obtained any bribe from him; and it seemed now impossible to avoid going through some form of reconciliation with him. This took place at Windsor, where Anselm was summoned to meet the king at Whitsuntide. One more artifice was tried to entrap him into a false position. It was proposed that he should receive the pall at the hands of the king, but he was inflexible; the gift of the pall pertained not to the royal dignity, but was the peculiar right of the successor of St. Peter. So the king had to give way.

On his way from the court Anselm was followed by two

bishops, Robert of Hereford and Osmund of Sarum, who expressed penitence for having joined with the other bishops in renouncing friendship with him. Anselm was moved with compassion, and readily absolved them in a little church which they passed on their way to Hayes.

On the third Sunday after Trinity, May 27, 1095, the cardinal legate brought the pall with great pomp to Canterbury in a silver casket. He was met by the monks of the two monasteries, Christchurch and St. Augustine's, and a vast concourse of clergy and laity. Near the cathedral the procession was met by Anselm barefoot, but in full pontificals, and attended by his suffragans. The sacred gift, having been laid upon the altar, was taken up by Anselm and presented to be kissed by the bystanders, after which he put it on and celebrated mass.

The pall bestowed on Anselm

A short interval of peace now ensued. The king went northwards to put down a revolt of Robert of Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland. The archbishop stayed at Canterbury, the care of the city, and apparently of Kent, being committed to him under the king's writ and seal, against an expected attack from Normandy. So faithful was he to this trust that he refused to leave Canterbury even for a day to confer with the papal legate on those reforms which he had at heart. The tone of his letters, however, implies that he was not very anxious to meet the cardinal, and suggests a suspicion that he was aware of some secret dealings between the legate and the king. At any rate he maintains that no real good could be effected except by a council at which the king, bishops, and nobles were present.

An interval of peace.

Anselm attended the Christmas council at Windsor, where his bitter adversary, William of St. Calais, Bishop of Durham, died. He received his confession and ministered to him in his dying hours with affectionate care. Most of the bishops now followed the example of Osmund of Sarum and Robert of Hereford in expressing sorrow and repentance for their conduct at Rockingham; yet there were some who still remained hostile, and when the papal legate remonstrated with them they had the incredible meanness to say that Anselm was not a lawful archbishop because he had received investiture from a king who, at the

Council at Windsor.

time, was in schism with Rome—the very king to whom they themselves had paid the most obsequious and servile homage.

During the interval of peace that followed the reconciliation at Windsor Anselm consecrated several bishops. He was so completely recognised as patriarch of the Western Isles that the Irish princes sent their bishops-elect to receive consecration at his hands. Samuel, an Irish monk of St. Albans, who had been elected to the archbishopric of Dublin by the king Murtagh, the clergy, and people, was consecrated (April 20, 1096) at Winchester in the mighty minster which Bishop Walkelin had just completed; and on December 28 of the same year, and at the request of the same king, a Winchester monk, Malchus by name, was consecrated at Canterbury to the see of Waterford, which had been vacant several years. Anselm was careful in both instances to ascertain by examination and inquiry that the elected bishop was duly qualified by learning and character for his office.

Consecration of bishops.

On November 18, 1095, the first Crusade was preached by Pope Urban at Clermont in Auvergne. Robert, Duke of Normandy, was seized with the impulse that stirred the heart of all Christendom, but his treasury was empty, and his hold on his duchy was weak. So he mortgaged it for three years to his brother William for the sum of 3000 marks, which the Red King undertook to raise. The sum was levied with great difficulty. The clergy were already so impoverished that to furnish contributions they were forced to part with many of their most sacred treasures. Anselm had not sufficient ready money to furnish his share, and by the advice of Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, and Gundulf of Rochester, he borrowed £100 of the monks of Christchurch on the security of the rents of his manor of Peckham, which he mortgaged to them for seven years. It turned out a very good bargain for the monks, who enlarged the cathedral eastwards out of the Peckham rents. In the end Anselm managed to scrape together £200, with which the king appears to have been satisfied.

Preaching of the first Crusade.

The bargain between the king and his brother was settled in September 1096. Robert started for Palestine. William took possession of Normandy, and remained in the duchy till

the following Easter, when he made a great expedition into Wales, which seemed to be successful, although the submission of the country turned out to be only nominal. On his return from Wales the king wrote Anselm an angry letter complaining of the contingent of knights which he had supplied for the Welsh campaign. They were so ill-equipped, he said, and ill-trained as to have been quite useless, and Anselm must expect a summons in the king's court to "do him right." Knowing that the king's court was the last place in which to expect justice, Anselm did not condescend to take any notice of this petulant message. He attended the Whitsuntide council and was graciously received; but his renewed appeals to the king to set about the work of reform were utterly vain.

Normandy mortgaged to Rufus.

The archbishop now resolved upon taking the step to which his mind had been inclining for some time past. He sent a formal message to the king by some of the lay lords saying that he was driven by urgent need to request leave to go to Rome. The king refused the license. Anselm repeated his request at another council held in August and again at Winchester in October. William was now thoroughly enraged; he not only refused the license, but said that Anselm must pay a fine for asking for it. Anselm offered to give good reasons for his request, but the king refused to hear him, and told him that if he did go he would seize the archbishopric and never receive him as archbishop again.

Anselm asks leave to go to Rome.

An adjournment was granted for one day, and on the morrow Anselm said he must still ask for the license. For the sake of his own soul, for the sake of religion, and for the king's own honour and profit it was needful he should go, and if the king would not grant him leave he must go without it, obeying God rather than man. The bishops continued to urge submission. They told Anselm in very plain terms that they themselves must adhere to the king. "We know you to be a devout and holy man; but we being hindered by our kinsfolk whom we support, and by manifold secular affairs, are unable to rise to your lofty standard of life, or to make a mock of this world as you do. We will not outstep the limits of the fealty which

The king refuses it.

we owe to the king." The indignation and contempt of Anselm were excited by this unblushing avowal of the principle of self-interest. "Ye have spoken well," he said, "go ye then to your lord, and I will cleave to my God." They took him at his word and departed; and Anselm was left almost alone. Presently the bishops returned accompanied by some of the lay lords. The latter also were now against him. He had sworn to observe the customs of the realm, and it was contrary to those customs that he should go to Rome without the king's license. Anselm's action was, no doubt, unconstitutional, although the character of the king makes it excusable. He was now called upon to swear that he would never appeal to the see of St. Peter in any matter, or else quit the realm at once, forfeiting his archbishopric. Anselm followed the lay lords back into the royal presence chamber, and seating himself on the king's right hand he argued that, since in every oath of fealty the formula was, "By the faith which I owe to God I will be faithful to thee," if the fealty promised to man were opposed to the fealty due to God the oath was thereby invalidated. The oath which the king wanted him now to take that he would never more appeal to St. Peter or his vicar was one which ought not to be taken. To swear that would be to forswear St. Peter, and to forswear St. Peter was to forswear Christ, who made him the chief ruler over His Church. Count Robert of Meulan interrupted him by exclaiming that he was preaching a sermon, and a great uproar ensued. Anselm quietly waited until it had subsided, and then having summed up his argument rose and departed, accompanied by the faithful Eadmer. They were followed by a messenger from William, who informed Anselm that he might leave the kingdom, but must not take anything belonging to the king. "I have horses, clothes, and furniture," replied Anselm, "perhaps some one will say that they belong to the king: if so I will go naked and barefoot rather than abandon my purpose."

Anselm departs.

The king sent word back that he did not wish him to go naked and barefoot, but he must be at Dover ready to cross within eleven days, and there a messenger would meet him and let him know what he might take with him. Anselm then returned to the presence chamber, and addressing the king with a pleasant and cheerful

countenance said, "Sir, I am going: if it might be with your good-will it would better become you, and be more agreeable to all good men; but since it is otherwise, although I regret it on your account, I for my part shall bear it with equanimity, nor shall I cease to desire the welfare of your soul. Now therefore not knowing when I shall see you again, I commend you to God, and as a spiritual father to a beloved son, as Archbishop of Canterbury to the King of England, I would fain give you God's blessing and my own, if you refuse it not, before I depart." "I do not refuse thy blessing," was the reply. Rufus bowed his head, as the man of God arose and made the sign of the cross over it. Then Anselm departed, the king and his company marvelling at his cheerfulness, and the saint and the sinner never met again.

This scene took place on October 15, 1097, and Anselm immediately left Winchester for Canterbury. On the day after his arrival he took an affecting farewell of the monks. Then, in the presence of a great congregation, he took the pilgrim's staff and scrip from off the altar, and having commended the weeping multitude to the care of Christ, he set forth for Dover, accompanied by Eadmer and Baldwin. There they found the king's chaplain, William of Warelwast, awaiting them; and he became their guest for fifteen days, during which they were detained by stress of weather. At last the wind was favourable, and Anselm and his party hastened to the shore. But William of Warelwast forbade their embarking until their baggage had been searched. He insisted on every article of it being opened and the contents examined upon the beach, which was done amidst the astonishment and execration of the bystanders: but nothing was found that could on any pretext be seized for the king, and after this insult and delay Anselm and his friends set sail and had a prosperous passage to Wissant. As soon as they had quitted the kingdom the king more than fulfilled his threats against the archbishop. He not only confiscated the estates of the see but cancelled all acts and decrees which had been made concerning them by Anselm during his primacy,—a proceeding which must have involved many persons in great hardship and loss.

His treatment at Dover.

The story of Anselm's sojourn on the Continent, which is

related in great detail by Eadmer, must be restricted in these pages to those incidents which affected more or less directly the fortunes of the Church in England. The winter was spent partly at the Abbey of Cluny, partly at Lyons with Archbishop Hugh, an old friend of Anselm. He was, moreover, the papal legate for Gaul, and at his recommendation Anselm addressed a letter to Urban. After recording how he had been forced into the archbishopric against his earnest wishes and remonstrances, he said he had now spent four fruitless years in office: he was continually witnessing evils which he ought not to tolerate and yet was powerless to restrain. The king had not only unjustly deprived the see of some of its property, but exacted onerous services from him unknown to his predecessors in the primacy. Divine law and canonical and apostolical authority were overridden by arbitrary customs, and remonstrance was vain. To go on enduring these evils would be to fasten them upon his successors to the peril of his own soul. There was no one in England who dared give him advice or assistance in these things. Wherefore he had resolved to seek counsel from the successor of the great apostle, and to implore him in the name of God to set him free from the cruel bondage to which he was now subjected, that he might serve God in peace.

Anselm writes to Pope Urban.

The bearers of the letter returned with a pressing invitation from the pope to visit him at Rome; and accordingly on March 16, 1098 Anselm and his party set forth. They were warmly welcomed by Urban and lodged in the Lateran palace. The day after their arrival there was a grand gathering of the Roman nobility at the papal palace. Anselm was introduced by Urban as the patriarch or pope of another world (*alterius orbis papa*), a miracle of virtue and learning, the champion of the Roman see, yet so humble as to seek from the present unworthy occupant of it the counsel which he himself was more fitted to give than to receive. In fact, Eadmer says, Anselm was quite disconcerted by the pope's flattery, and blushed deeply, as was his wont when he heard praise of himself which he thought exaggerated or undeserved. After the public reception Urban heard the narrative of his wrongs and promised him his support.

His reception at Rome, 1098.

Meanwhile the season was approaching when Rome was unhealthy for strangers, and Anselm was urged by the Abbot of Telese in Apulia, formerly one of his scholars at Bec, to take up his abode with him. This he did, with the consent of the pope, and as the heat increased the abbot transferred him to the mountain village of Schiavi, now Liberi. The weary old man was enchanted with the seclusion and repose in this cool and sweet retreat. "This shall be my rest," he said, "here will I dwell, for I have a delight therein." He resumed the simple studious habits which he had loved so well in his happy tranquil days at Bec, and he completed his treatise on the Incarnation, the *Cur Deus homo?* which he had begun amidst all the turmoil of his life in England.

Anselm in Apulia.

He was not permitted, however, to spend the whole of the summer in this delightful retirement. Roger, the Norman Duke of Apulia, was besieging Capua, which had revolted from his rule, and he requested Anselm to pay him a visit in his camp. He was received with great honour, and he and his attendants were handsomely lodged outside the camp in tents adjacent to some which had been provided for Pope Urban. The two pontiffs were in constant communication, and Anselm again entreated the pope to let him lay down the useless burden of the primacy, as the tidings that travellers had brought him of the outrages on religion and morals perpetrated by the Red King convinced him that so long as William was on the throne he could do no good in England. Urban, however, refused to release him, and professed to be shocked at his proposal to abandon Christ's sheep to be devoured by wolves. Anselm said that he was ready to suffer violence or death itself in defence of the flock of Christ, but he had been driven from the kingdom, and the bishops who had promised obedience to him and should have helped him in defending the flock gave him no assistance, and tried, under the semblance of justice, to make him commit injustice, placing fealty to the sovereign before obedience to the apostolic see. Urban expressed himself satisfied with Anselm's defence and renewed his assurances of help. He invited him to attend the council which he was about to hold at Bari on St. Nicholas Day, October 1, when he should see and hear

Received by the Norman Duke

how he purposed to act concerning the English king and men like-minded who lifted themselves up against the liberty of God's Church. Pending the meeting of the council Anselm withdrew with great contentment to his quiet retreat at Schiavi.

At the Council of Bari the doctrinal question of the "procession of the Holy Ghost" was discussed with the delegates of the Eastern Church. A hot debate arose. The pope referred to Anselm's work on the Incarnation, and presently called upon him to step forward and vindicate the true doctrine of the Holy Ghost before the assembly. At the same time he expatiated on the wrongs which had driven him from England. Anselm's speech on the doctrinal question was delivered the next day, and is described as a masterpiece of learning and eloquence, for which he was publicly thanked by the pope; but we have no detailed report of it. The assembly then discussed the conduct of the King of England. The pope stated that he had frequently addressed rebukes and warnings to him, but with what result was proved by his persecution and expulsion of the holy man who was now before them. "What think ye, brethren," he said, "of these things, and how do ye determine?" There was a unanimous judgment in favour of excommunication. "Be it so," said the pope. At this point Anselm, who had been sitting in silence with downcast eyes, got up, and kneeling down before the pope persuaded him, but with difficulty, to postpone passing sentence, on the king. Urban, however, was a wary man, and subsequent events suggest a doubt whether he had intended to do more than make a demonstration.

Anselm at Council of Bari, Oct. 1, 1098.

Anselm and his followers accompanied the pope to Rome after the Council of Bari. Soon after their arrival, shortly before Christmas 1098, a messenger who had been sent to England with letters to the king from the pope and Anselm returned, with the tidings that Rufus had accepted in some sort the letters of the pope but had flatly refused to receive the letters of Anselm, and when he heard that the bearer of them was Anselm's man he had sworn by God's face that if he did not promptly quit the country he would have his eyes plucked out.

He returns to Rome.

In the course of a few days another visitor from England appeared in the person of William of Warelwast, who came as the emissary and advocate of his master the Red King. In a public audience Urban adopted a severe and threatening tone, bidding him inform the king that if he did not reinstate Anselm before the council to be held at the following Easter, he must expect the sentence of excommunication. William's agent, however, knew how to deal with the papal court. He tarried several days in Rome and made good use of his time by a judicious distribution of gifts amongst the pope's counsellors, with the result that the pope was persuaded to grant William a respite to the following Michælmas. According to William of Malmesbury, Urban, after a long struggle between his respect for Anselm and his inclination, accepted the king's gifts. Eadmer, however, does not accuse the pope himself of yielding to bribes. Nevertheless Anselm perceived that he had been leaning on a broken reed, and resolved not to waste any more time in dangling attendance on the pope. He had sought protection of his rights and redress of his wrongs from the apostolic see, which should have been the chief source of righteousness and justice in the world, and he had found the fountain poisoned by his persecutor and oppressor. It was an experience destined to be frequently repeated in the history of English appeals to Rome. The integrity of the papal court was rarely proof against the argument of gold and silver.

William of Warelwast arrives.

So Anselm asked leave to return to Lyons: but the pope insisted on his remaining for the great council to be held at Easter, and meanwhile paid him all possible honour; he and his friends were comfortably lodged in the Lateran; the pope frequently visited him and placed him next himself in all public assemblies and processions.

When the council assembled in St. Peter's in April 1099, there was some curiosity to see where Anselm would be seated, as no one present had ever seen an Archbishop of Canterbury at a general council in Rome. The pope ordered him to be placed in the seat of honour opposite himself in the centre of the half circle of prelates who sat facing the papal chair on either side. Decrees were passed or renewed against simony and clerical marriages,

Council at Rome, 1099.

and anathema was pronounced on any layman who should bestow investiture of an ecclesiastical benefice, or the clerk who should receive it at his hands and become his man. This decree was flatly opposed to the custom of England and Normandy, and became, as we shall see, the main subject of dispute between Anselm and Henry I.

A strange scene.

When the time came for reading out the decrees of the council a strange scene occurred. As the assembly was very large, and there was a considerable noise owing to the crowds passing to and from the shrine of St. Peter, the pope ordered Reineger, the Bishop of Lucca, a man of great stature and powerful voice, to read so that all might hear. Reineger read a little way, then suddenly stopped, and burst forth into an indignant declamation upon the uselessness of passing new laws when they did nothing to right a man who was the meek victim of tyrannical oppression. "If you do not all perceive of whom I am speaking, it is Anselm, Archbishop of England." So saying, he smote on the floor thrice with his pastoral staff, and uttered a groan, with lips and teeth tightly closed. "Enough, enough, brother Reineger," said the pope, "good counsel shall be taken touching this matter." "Truly," replied Reineger, "it had better be; otherwise the matter will not escape Him who judges righteously." The whole scene reads like a piece of acting, and Anselm clearly suspected it to be so. Eadmer says that he was astonished when he heard the speech of the bishop, since neither he himself nor any of his friends had spoken to him on the subject. He sat, therefore, listening in silent amazement to this unexpected outburst. At any rate, nothing came of it, and the next day Anselm left Rome, "having obtained," as his biographer remarks with subdued irony, "nought of counsel or aid save such as I have related." Travelling by circuitous routes to avoid the agent of the anti-pope, who had sent an artist to sketch his face when he was at Rome, they reached Lyons in safety, and were heartily welcomed by their old friend, Archbishop Hugh. Anselm resided with him, and assisted him in his episcopal duties.

What attitude Pope Urban would have assumed towards the Red King after Michaelmas can only be conjectured, for

before that date he was no more. His death occurred on July 29. When it was announced to Rufus, "May God's hate," he exclaimed, "rest on him who cares for that." On hearing of the election of Paschal II. he inquired what manner of man he was, and being informed that in some respects he was like Anselm, he burst forth, "Then by God's face he is no good; but let him be what he will, his popedom shall not get over me this time. I have gained my liberty, and shall do what I please."

Death of Pope Urban, July 28, 1099,

He did not long enjoy his boasted liberty. On August 2 of the following year, 1100, he fell dead when hunting in the New Forest, pierced by an arrow from an unknown hand. The body, dripping with blood, was conveyed in a cart to Winchester. There, in the middle of the choir, beneath the central tower of Bishop Walkelin's minster, just seven years after its completion, the remains of the wicked king were buried, without full funeral rites, "in the presence," says William of Malmesbury, "of many, but the mourning of few." The fall of the tower seven years afterwards was, in popular belief, a token of Divine displeasure at the burial of so impious a person within the hallowed walls of the cathedral.

and of William Rufus, Aug. 2, 1100.

AUTHORITIES.—The primary authorities for all that relates to Anselm are Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* and his *Vita Anselmi* (both in the Rolls series). Eadmer, being Anselm's chaplain and intimate friend, was an eye-witness of most of the events which he relates. Anselm's letters, numbering more than 400, are printed in Migne's *Patrolog. Lat.* clix. Among modern biographies the most noteworthy are by Charles de Rémusat, Paris, 1868; Charma, Paris, 1853; R. W. Church, late Dean of St. Paul's; J. M. Rigg, (Methuen) 1899. Mr. Rigg deals more especially with Anselm's writings. Copious references occur in Freeman's *Norm. Conq.* vols. iii. iv. and v., and his *Reign of William Rufus*, I. iv. and II. vii. A long list of literature in connection with Anselm will be found at the end of the article on him by the present writer in the *Dict. of National Biography*, and a fuller account of some parts of his history.

CHAPTER VI

ANSELM AND HENRY I

ANSELM was sojourning at the monastery of La Chaise-Dieu (Casa Dei), in Auvergne, when the tidings of William's death were brought to him by two monks — one from Canterbury, the other from Bec. At first he was stupefied by the shock; presently he burst into a flood of tears. His friends were astonished at this exhibition of grief over such a man, but Anselm, in a voice broken by sobs, declared that he would rather have died himself than that the king should have perished, being what he was. He returned to Lyons, where another monk from Canterbury met him, bearing a letter from the mother Church, entreating him to return to his sorrowing children, now that the tyrant was no more. Archbishop Hugh was most unwilling to part with him, but owned that it was his duty to go. So he started, accompanied by a multitude of people who mourned his departure. Before he reached Cluny another messenger came, bringing a letter from the new King Henry, and a message from the lay lords begging him to return with all speed, and even upbraiding him for not coming sooner.

Anselm hears of the king's death.

Henry in his letter states that he has been elected by the clergy and people of England, and entreats Anselm to come with all speed. To his counsel he entrusts himself and the people of England; he would rather have been crowned and blessed by Anselm than by any other, but he dared not delay the ceremony owing to the activity of his enemies. He would have sent him money by

Henry I. begs him to return.

the hand of a special messenger, had not the disturbed state of the Continent since his brother's death rendered travelling unsafe. He recommends Anselm to make his way to Wissant, avoiding Normandy, where the Norman nobles were intriguing with Duke Robert against his brother; at Dover he should be met by the king's barons, and any money that he might have borrowed for the expenses of his journey should be repaid him.

Henry, having hastened to Winchester and seized the royal treasure immediately after his brother's death, had pressed on to London, and was crowned in Westminster Abbey by Maurice, Bishop of London, on August 5. He swore at his coronation to obtain true peace for the Church of God and all Christian folk, to put down injustice and plunder, and to order equity and mercy in all judgments. The promises contained in the coronation oath were presently renewed and amplified in a formal charter addressed to all the faithful, in which the evils of the late king's reign were enumerated and renounced, and forbidden for the future. In the first article of the charter he declares that out of the fear of God and the love that he bears to his people he makes the holy Church of God free, so that he will neither sell her nor put her to farm. On the death of an archbishop, bishop, or abbot he will take nothing during the vacancy from the demesne of the church, or from the tenants, and he will put away the evil customs by which the kingdom was unjustly oppressed during his brother's reign.

Coronation and charter of Henry I.

Anselm landed at Dover on September 23, 1100. His return after nearly three years' absence was welcomed with transports of joy by the whole country. The hopes and prospects of the nation and Church revived. But as regarded the relations between the king and the primate they speedily received a check. A few days after his arrival in England Anselm met Henry at Salisbury, where he was cordially greeted by the king. The temporalities of the archbishopric being in the king's hands, he required Anselm to do homage to him for their restitution, according to the ancient custom in England. But Anselm replied that he could not do this in the face of the canons recently passed by the councils of Bari and Rome, which

Anselm returns.

forbade clerics to receive investiture at the hands of laymen or do homage to them for their benefices. He could not hold communion with any, whether clerks or laymen, who violated these canons. The king was grievously perplexed. He was most unwilling to surrender the ancient rights of investiture and homage, but he was also most unwilling to quarrel with Anselm, and especially before he was firmly established on the throne. His brother Robert had recently returned from Palestine, and if Anselm withdrew to Normandy he might easily induce Duke Robert to submit to the papal decrees, and might consecrate him King of England as the reward of his submission. We may be sure that Anselm would not have acted so basely and deceitfully, but the tone of political morality was low, and probably few men gave him credit for the absolute rectitude and integrity of purpose by which he was animated. The king proposed that the question in dispute should be suspended until the following Easter, and that in the interval envoys should be sent to Rome to try to induce the pope to relax the canons in favour of the ancient customs of the realm. Anselm meanwhile was to be reinstated in all the possessions of the see. He consented to the arrangement, although he had little expectation that the pope would yield; but he was anxious to allay any suspicions that might be entertained of his loyalty to the new king. There is no evidence that Anselm personally had any objections to the customs in question. His original unwillingness to accept the archbishopric had rested entirely upon other grounds, and the office once accepted, he had made no scruple of doing homage to the king. His present opposition to Henry arose from a sense of obligation to obey the decrees of the Church which had been issued by papal authority since he had become archbishop.

Fresh difficulties.

While matters were thus in a state of suspense, Anselm did the king a piece of good service. Henry was desirous of marrying Matilda (or Eadgyth, if we call her by her English name), the daughter of Malcolm, King of Scotland, and Margaret his wife. Margaret was the granddaughter of Eadmund Ironside, and thus an alliance with her daughter would connect Henry with the old royal

Marriage of Henry I.

line of England. But it was objected that Matilda had become a nun, and therefore could not legally be married. She sought the advice of Anselm. She told him that she had been sent to England as a child to be educated under the care of her aunt Christina, who was a nun in the monastery of Romsey. She had never taken the vows, but her aunt had compelled her to wear a veil to protect her from insults at the hands of brutal Normans, probably in the evil reign of William Rufus. Her father King Malcolm had vehemently objected to her wearing the veil, and she herself had torn it off whenever she could, and even trampled it under her feet, although her aunt had beaten her for her disobedience, and scolded her in very coarse language. Anselm submitted the case to a large assembly of clerics and laymen at Lambeth. He cautioned them not to be actuated by fear or favour in forming their judgment. The court heard the evidence of the maiden herself and of others; they considered the analogous cases of young women who had assumed the veil after the Norman Conquest in order to secure themselves from the violence of the invaders, and who had been pronounced free to marry by Archbishop Lanfranc after the pacification of the country. The court, therefore, unanimously decided that there was no lawful impediment to the marriage of Matilda. Anselm approved the judgment. In the face of a vast congregation, which assembled to witness the marriage in Westminster Abbey, he challenged any one who disputed its legality to come forward and prove his objection. A unanimous shout of approval was the response. Anselm celebrated and blessed the marriage on November 11, 1100. Matilda—"Mold the Good Queen," as she was affectionately called by the people, to whom she endeared herself by her bounty and kindness—was not only a woman of genuine piety, like her mother, St. Margaret of Scotland, but of more than ordinary learning and ability. She remained the firm friend of Anselm through all his difficulties, and frequently corresponded with him when he was absent from England.

Before the return of the envoys from Rome, Guy, Archbishop of Vienne, arrived in England alleging that he had been appointed legate of all Britain by the command and

authority of the apostolic see. This announcement, says Eadmer, was received with astonishment, it was an unheard-of thing that any one should act as papal legate in England save the Archbishop of Canterbury, although legates had been occasionally sent at the request of the king for some special purpose. So the intruder had to return without having been acknowledged, or permitted to perform any legatine act.

A papal legate repulsed.

Easter came, 1101, but the envoys had not returned. The truce, therefore, between Henry and Anselm was extended, and meanwhile he rendered the king another good service. Ralph Flambard, the infamous minister of William Rufus, had been rewarded the year before the king died by being elevated to the wealthy bishopric of Durham, which had been kept vacant three years. One of the first acts of Henry after his accession was to imprison Bishop Ralph in the Tower (August 15). When Anselm returned to England in September he found the nation rejoicing over the captivity of Ralph as over that of a ravenous lion. He was prosecuted in the king's court for misappropriation of revenue. Even then Anselm, to whom he appealed as a brother bishop, would have helped him if he could have purged himself of the guilt of simony, but this he could not do. He was not very rigorously treated or guarded in the Tower, and managed to escape by the aid of a rope conveyed to his chamber in a wine stoup, with the contents of which he had made his guards drunk. He made his way to Normandy, and incited the king's brother Robert to venture upon an invasion of England. It was a critical time for Henry. The chief men of Norman birth in England wavered in their allegiance. At the Whitsuntide Council king and nobles met with mutual suspicion. Both sides invoked the aid of Anselm as a mediator. The king, holding his hand, renewed the promise of good laws which he had made at his coronation. In July Robert landed at Portchester. An engagement between the forces of the rival brothers seemed imminent near Alton; but this calamity was averted. The mass of the English army and the bishops, mainly owing to the exhortations of Anselm, remained staunch to Henry. The brothers held a parley and came to terms

Duke Robert invades England.

Anselm mediates.

without fighting. Robert gave up his claim on England. Henry gave up his possessions in Normandy except Domfront; but this was only for a little time.

At last the envoys returned from Rome. They brought a letter from the pope, Paschal II., distinctly repudiating Henry's claim to the right of investing prelates by the delivery of the pastoral staff and ring. Christ had said, "I am the door," if kings therefore asserted themselves to be the door of the Church, those who entered it through that door were thieves and robbers, for Christ had said, "He that entereth not by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." The pope quoted Ambrose and Justinian in support of his position that the sovereign had no right to appoint to sacred offices. A bishop was married to his Church, and a marriage could not be validly celebrated except by Jesus Christ acting through His minister or vicar. It was a strong line for the pope to take; his will and the will of the king were placed in direct conflict. Henry was not a violent man like Rufus, and he did not wish to quarrel with Anselm, but he was strong-willed and resolute. Anselm was summoned to court, and again asked to do homage. He replied that he must abide by the decrees of the Council at which he had been present. He was offered the alternative of consecrating the prelates who had been invested by the king, or quitting the country. He would do neither. He could not subject himself to the excommunication pronounced upon any one who accepted lay investiture. And he had no mind to leave the country; he would go to his own church and discharge his duty there.

Envoys return from Rome.

Not long after his return to Canterbury, he received a friendly letter from the king inviting him to attend the court at Winchester, and here it was determined, in a large assembly of prelates and nobles, that a second and more distinguished embassy should be sent to Rome, representing both sides. On Anselm's side were his old friend and companion, Baldwin of Bec, and Alexander, a monk of Canterbury; on the side of the king were Gerard, Archbishop of York, who went also to fetch his pall, Herbert Losinga, Bishop of Norwich, and Robert, Bishop of Chester.

Second embassy to Rome.

The envoys found Paschal as inflexible as before. A letter was written to the king, praising him for having abandoned the impious ways of his brother, for restoring the churches their liberty, and treating the clergy and bishops with respect, but warning him that if he would not forfeit the favour of God he must not allow himself to be seduced into the sin of granting investiture to bishops and abbots. To Anselm also he wrote, encouraging him to persevere in his present attitude. The decrees forbidding investiture by laymen had been confirmed in a synod at the Lateran, and he regarded the practice as a root of simony, tempting foolish clerks to pay court to secular persons in order to obtain ecclesiastical preferment.

Letters from Pope Paschal.

On the return of the envoys a council of the great men of the realm was summoned in London. Anselm was again offered the alternatives of accepting the ancient custom or quitting the kingdom. He said that he was ready to submit to the king's will so far as was consistent with his honour and obedience to the apostolic see; and he offered to exhibit the letter which he had received from the pope, that all might know what was required of him. The king, on the other hand, would not permit the pope's letter to himself to be made public. And then, to the amazement of every one, the king's agents came forward and declared, on their faith as bishops, that the pope in a private interview had bidden them tell the king that so long as he appointed good and pious prelates, and otherwise conducted himself as a virtuous prince, the pope would not interfere with his claim to investiture, but, they said, the pope would not commit this to writing lest other princes should quote it as a precedent. Anselm's agents expressed the greatest astonishment at this announcement. The assembly was divided in opinion. Some maintained that the greatest credence must be given to letters bearing the pope's own signature and seal, others that the word of bishops must outweigh the authority of writings supported only by the testimony of insignificant monks (*monachellorum*) unversed in secular affairs. In such a conflict of evidence and opinion there was clearly no choice left but to send yet another deputation to Rome to learn what the pope had really said. All that Anselm

A council in London.

A third embassy to Rome.

desired to know was the truth. He wrote to the pope, saying that he did not wish to doubt either the papal letter or the word of the bishops. Let the pope exempt England from the decrees about investiture, or let him say that they were to be obeyed, and Anselm was prepared either to let them lapse or to enforce them at the peril of his life.

Meanwhile he consented to the king acting on the assumption that the statement of the bishops was true, and investing prelates with the ring and staff, provided he was not required to consecrate them. The king lost no time in acting upon this understanding. He gave the see of Sarum to his clerk Roger, who became one of the ablest chancellors of the realm, and Hereford to another Roger, who had been the steward of his larder.

During this period of compromise, about Michaelmas 1102, a large mixed council was held at Westminster for the reform of abuses ecclesiastical and moral. It was the kind of national council for which Anselm had repeatedly asked in vain during the reign of Rufus. Several abbots were deposed for simony or other offences,—Guy, Abbot of Pershore, Winward of Tavistock, Ealdwin of Ramsey, Richard of Ely, and Robert of St. Edmundsbury. Decrees were passed prohibiting the marriage of the clergy, forbidding bishops and clergy to wear the dress of laymen, forbidding monasteries to appropriate churches unless assigned to them by bishops, and requiring them to take care that such churches were not stripped so bare of revenue as to reduce the priests who served them to penury. Abbots were required to eat and sleep under the same roof with their monks, except in cases of necessity. A decree was also passed against the slave traffic in England, whereby, it was stated, human beings had been sold like brute beasts; and other decrees were passed against those gross forms of vice which had prevailed during the reign of the late king.

Council at Westminster, 1102.

Henry, however, seems to have violated the terms of the compromise with Anselm by asking him to consecrate the bishops whom he had appointed and invested. Anselm of course refused, and Gerard, Archbishop of York, a time-serving courtier, who had been one of the royal envoys to Rome, and was ready to consecrate

Two bishops refuse consecration.

anybody at the king's request, was called upon to discharge the duty. But, to the general surprise, some of the king's nominees now began to turn scrupulous. Reinhelm, the queen's chancellor, a new bishop-elect of Hereford (Roger having died soon after his appointment), sent back his ring and staff, and William Giffard, elect of Winchester, declared that he would rather be spoiled of all his goods than receive the rite of consecration at the hands of Gerard. A crowd who had come to witness the consecrations applauded the resolution of William; but the king was highly displeased, and in spite of Anselm's intercession, Bishop William was banished and the revenues of the see confiscated. William Giffard had previously refused to be invested with the staff by the king's hands, so that Anselm was quite ready to consecrate him. He had already enthroned him at Winchester, and delivered the pastoral staff to him, but Henry insisted that Anselm should either consecrate all the bishops that were presented to him, or none.

About the middle of the following Lent, 1103, the king and Anselm met at Canterbury. The messengers had returned from Rome, bringing an indignant repudiation by the pope of the story told by Gerard and the other envoys, and bearing a letter for Anselm which, they said, confirmed the contents of the former letters in every particular. The king, however, would not have the letter read, and Anselm deemed it prudent to abstain for the present from opening it, lest there should be any discrepancy between its contents and the verbal report of the messengers, which would have complicated the situation. Henry said his patience was quite worn out, and he would brook no more delays; the pope had nothing to do with rights that he and all his predecessors had enjoyed. He still demanded unqualified submission. Anselm continued, as ever, respectful but firm; he had no wish, he said, to deprive the king of rights that really belonged to him, but he could not, even to save his life, disobey canons which he had, with his own ears, heard promulgated in the Roman council. For the moment the aspect of affairs seemed blacker than ever. Men began even to fear for the personal safety of the primate, when Henry suddenly, and with a mildness that makes one think

The king urges Anselm to go to Rome.

he may have been assuming all along more sternness than he felt, suggested, almost besought, Anselm to go himself to Rome and try whether he could not induce the pope to give way. This proposal was reserved, at the request of Anselm, for the decision of the Easter council, soon to be held at Winchester. The council urged him to go. He replied that since it was their will he would go, weak and aged though he was, but he warned them that the pope would certainly not do anything inconsistent with the liberty of the Church.

He now hastened to Canterbury, and four days afterwards embarked at Dover and landed at Wissant on April 27. He had not to suffer any indignities this time, but travelled in the king's peace, and throughout his absence from England he and Henry kept up a friendly correspondence. At Bec he was received with transports of joy and affection. Here he opened the letter from Pope Paschal, which he had forborne to open in England, and found it to be in perfect harmony with the report of the messengers. The pope indignantly denied the statement of the king's envoys, and declared them excommunicate until they should confess their guilt, and make satisfaction for it to the Holy See.

Anselm sets out, April 1103.

Anselm spent Whitsuntide at Chartres on the invitation of Bishop Ivo, and by his advice postponed his journey to Rome on account of the excessive heat. Accordingly he spent the summer at Bec, to the great joy of the brethren there, and set out again for Italy about the end of August. At Rome he found his old opponent, William of Warelwast, who had arrived a few days before him and had come to act as the king's advocate. Anselm was lodged in his old quarters adjacent to the Lateran Palace, and was requested to repose for two days after the fatigue of the journey before presenting himself to the pope and his council. William of Warelwast here pleaded so skilfully, dilating especially upon the munificence of the kings of England, and the great loss which the papal court would suffer if friendly relations with Henry were broken off, that he made a great impression on some of the pope's councillors; and he boldly wound up his harangue: "Know all men present that not to save his kingdom will King Henry part with the investitures

Anselm at Rome.

of churches." "And, before God, not to save his life will Pope Paschal let him have them," was the reply. It had a brave and determined sound, but by the advice of the council a very mild letter was despatched to Henry informing him that though the right of investiture could not be granted, and those who received it at his hand must be excommunicated, yet he himself should be exempted from excommunication, and enjoy the exercise of all other ancestral customs. It fact it was intended to be a soothing letter, and the points at issue were somewhat veiled by compliments and congratulations to the king on the birth of his son.

Anselm leaves Rome.

Meanwhile Anselm and his friends set out on their homeward journey. The pope embraced Anselm and gave him his benediction, together with a letter, in which he confirmed him in all the powers and privileges of the primacy as they had been enjoyed by his predecessors from the days of Augustine. William of Warelwast tarried in Rome, purporting to be under a vow to visit the shrine of St. Nicholas of Bari, but in reality to try and induce the pope to alter his mind. He only succeeded, however, in obtaining a letter very similar to the former one, with the exception that nothing was now said as to the excommunication of those who had received investiture from laymen. William now set out on his return home, and at Piacenza he overtook Anselm and his party, who had been escorted across the Apennines by the renowned Countess Matilda, the friend of Gregory VII., the devoted supporter of the papal cause. They expressed astonishment, no doubt ironically, at the rapidity with which William had accomplished his pilgrimage to Bari; yet trying as his company must have been, they travelled together as far as Lyons. Here Anselm halted to spend Christmas with his old friend the archbishop, while William of Warelwast pushed on to England. Before they parted William told Anselm that he had been bidden by the king to say that he felt the warmest regard for him, and that if Anselm would only be to the king all that his predecessor had been to Henry's predecessors he would be right gladly welcomed. "Have you no more to say," asked Anselm. "I speak to a man of understanding," was the reply. "I know what you mean," rejoined Anselm; and so they parted.

In a letter to the king Anselm referred to the message which William had delivered to him. He regretted that he could not be to Henry exactly what Lanfanc had been to Henry's father, because he was in a different position. He could not do homage to the king nor communicate with those who had received investiture from him, because to do so would be contrary to the decrees which had been made in his own hearing. He begged the king therefore to signify his pleasure whether he might return to England in peace and discharge the duties of his office. He was ready to do his duty faithfully to the king and the people committed to his care, saving his canonical obedience. If he was not permitted to return on this condition, any damage that might ensue to the souls of the people would not be his fault. But for the present the king was obdurate. As soon as William of Warelwast had reported the result of his embassy Henry confiscated the revenues of the see; but two of the archbishop's own men were appointed receivers, that the tenants might not be oppressed, and Anselm was to be allowed what he required for his own needs. A monk from Canterbury was sent to Anselm at Lyons with a letter from the king informing him that he was not to return to England unless he would accept all the customs which had been in use in the days of Henry's father and brother. As Anselm could not do this he remained at Lyons. During his sojourn there, which lasted sixteen months, the king kept up an amicable correspondence with him, while some of the clergy wrote reproachful letters to him, giving him a deplorable account of the scandalous appointments made to spiritual offices, the relaxation of church discipline, and the moral corruption everywhere prevalent; attributing these evils in a great measure to the absence of the archbishop. Anselm, however, was inflexible. The point in dispute must be settled before he would move. He would be to Henry all that Lanfranc had been to Henry's father, if the decrees which had been passed since Lanfranc's time were rescinded by the same authority that had issued them.

Anselm writes to the king.

Anselm at Lyons.

Henry meanwhile had sent yet another embassy to Rome. His aim seems to have been twofold. He wanted to persuade the pope to dispense with the canon against lay

investiture in his favour, and he hoped meanwhile to persuade Anselm to act on the assumption that the pope would yield. He was not successful in either of these aims. Pope Paschal did not dare, even for the sake of securing Henry's support, openly to set aside the canons of a Roman council, although he was dilatory and hesitating. The perfect straightforwardness and firmness of Anselm were embarrassing to both Henry and the pope. Neither of them wanted to act with thorough honesty of purpose, nothing short of which would satisfy Anselm. He continually sent letters or messengers to the pope but received only vague promises of support which came to nothing, while from Henry he received only polite excuses.

A fourth embassy to Rome.

At last he resolved on an act which should force the question to a crisis. In the summer of 1105 he set out for Normandy, where the king then was. On the way he visited Adela, Countess of Blois, sister of King Henry, and told her that, for the wrong which her brother had done to God and to His Church for two years and more, he was about to excommunicate him. Adela was greatly distressed, and Henry himself was alarmed when he heard of Anselm's intention. To suffer excommunication from such a man as Anselm would have damaged his reputation and strengthened the hands of his adversaries in the critical struggle in which he was then engaged for the possession of Normandy. Through the mediation of Adela an interview was arranged between the king and the primate at Laigle on July 22. Nothing could exceed the courtesy of Henry. He restored the revenues of the see; he implored Anselm to return; but he still insisted that the prelates whom he had invested should be recognised, and to this Anselm would not consent, unless permission was given from Rome. This involved yet another embassy, and there was considerable delay in sending it.

Anselm threatens to excommunicate Henry.

Fifth embassy to Rome.

Meanwhile Henry added to the list of his wrongs done to the Church by levying heavy taxes upon the clergy for the expenses of his war in Normandy. He began by exacting fines from those who had disobeyed the decrees prohibiting marriage, but finding the sum thus raised inadequate, he imposed the tax on the whole

Henry fines the clergy.

body. The clergy, in great distress, implored "good Queen Mold" to plead for them with the king; but, though moved to tears by their sad plight, she dared not interfere. In this strait even the courtier bishops turned to Anselm for help. They wrote a piteous letter, saying that if only he would come back they would stand by him and fight for the honour of Christ. Anselm wrote a sympathetic reply, mixed with some gently ironical congratulations on their having at last discovered the consequences of their subservience; but expressing his regret that he could not return until the pope had decided the point in dispute between him and the king. Meanwhile he had written a severe letter to Henry, reproving him for presuming to punish priests, a duty that pertained to bishops only, and warning him that the money so raised would not turn to his profit. At the same time he wrote to his archdeacon and to the prior and chapter of Canterbury, ordering the penalties of deprivation, or excommunication to be enforced upon those clergy who broke the canons concerning marriage.

And now, at last, this weary strife began to draw to an end. In April 1106 William of Warelwast and Baldwin of Bec returned from Rome with the latest instructions of the pope. Anselm was authorised to release from excommunication those who had broken the canons concerning investiture and homage. The judgment laid down no rule for the future, but it set Anselm free to return and renew intercourse with the offending bishops. The king sent messengers to Anselm at Bec, urging him to come without delay. He was detained, however, for some time, partly at Bec, partly at Jumieges, by alarming illness. Henry expressed the greatest anxiety about him, ordered all his wants to be supplied, and said he should shortly cross over to Normandy and pay him a visit. Just when he seemed on the brink of death he began to recover, and on the Feast of the Assumption he was well enough to see the king at Bec. At this interview Henry pledged himself to release the churches from all the vexatious burdens laid on them by his brother, to exact no more fines from the clergy, to compensate in the course of three years those who had already paid them, and to restore everything that he had kept in his hands belonging

Strife draws to an end.

to the see of Canterbury. Anselm now started for England, and, landing at Dover, was greeted with enthusiastic joy, in which the queen took a prominent part, going to meet him and then travelling in advance to arrange for his comfort at the places where he halted. Henry remained in Normandy, and before long wrote to Anselm, announcing his decisive victory at Tinchebrai over his brother Robert, September 28, 1106, and the complete subjugation of Normandy.

The final and public settlement of the long dispute concerning investiture was delayed from various causes, including a severe illness of Anselm, until the following year, 1107, when a large council was held in London on August 1. The question was debated for three days by the king and the bishops, Anselm being absent. Some were for still insisting on the old custom, but Pope Paschal having conceded the question of homage, Henry was the more ready on his part to concede the right of investiture. In the presence therefore of Anselm and a great crowd of witnesses, the king granted and decreed that thenceforth no man in England should be invested with bishopric or abbey by staff or ring at the hand of the king or any other layman, and Anselm on his side promised that no one elected to a prelacy should be debarred from consecration by having done homage to the king.[1]

Final settlement, August 1, 1107.

In accordance with this compromise many churches in England and Normandy, which had long been destitute of incumbents, were now provided for by the king, but without any investiture at his hands with ring and staff. Anselm, in his turn, consecrated on August 11 five bishops,—William Giffard to Winchester, and Reinhelm to Hereford, Roger to Salisbury, William of Warelwast (so long Anselm's opponent but now his friend) to Exeter, and Urban to Llandaff.

Henry exhibited a like spirit of wise compromise on some other questions in connection with the Church. He granted the chapters the right of electing the bishops, but the election

[1] This settlement of the investiture strife in England anticipated by fifteen years the Concordat of Worms by which the Emperor Henry V. surrendered the right of investing with the ring and staff. The Pope Calixtus II. in his turn conceded that in the German kingdom elections of bishops and abbots should be made in the presence of the emperor or his commissioner, and the elected prelate should receive his temporalities by touch of the sceptre.

had to be held in his court. Councils might be held at the option of the archbishop, but the consent of the king had to be obtained before they could meet or frame canons. Papal jurisdiction was recognised, but no legate might visit the kingdom without the royal license.

Anselm survived the conclusion of his protracted struggle for the rights and liberties of the Church little more than eighteen months; and during this brief remainder of his life he was repeatedly attacked by severe illness. But in the intervals he was actively employed, and we see the same indomitable spirit at work. He not only laboured to enforce the canons of London against simony and the marriage of the clergy but, largely through his efforts, the king was induced to put down false coining with a strong hand, and maintain a stricter discipline on his progresses amongst his attendants, whose insults and acts of violence had long been a cause of misery to the people. He also promoted the formation of a new diocese, with the see at Ely, to relieve the vast diocese of Lincoln, and he upheld the supremacy of Canterbury against the pretensions of Thomas, archbishop-elect of York, who tried to evade making his profession of obedience. Anselm died before the matter was settled, but soon after his death Thomas was compelled to make his profession by a decree passed in a council at London.

Anselm's last days.

Nor were his literary activities diminished: he carried on a wide correspondence with distinguished persons, clerical and lay, who sought his counsel in all parts of Christendom, including Alexander, King of the Scots, Murdach, an Irish prince, and Baldwin, King of Jerusalem; and he wrote the last of his theological treatises "concerning the agreement of foreknowledge, predestination, and the grace of God with free will." The composition of this treatise was delayed by frequent interruptions of illness and increasing weakness. At last he became so feeble that he had to be carried in a litter from place to place. Till within four days of his death he was carried daily into his chapel to attend mass. Then he took to his bed. On Palm Sunday 1109 one of the brethren who stood round his bed having said that they thought he was about to leave the world to keep the Easter court of his Lord,

he replied, "If His will be so I shall gladly obey it; but if He were willing that I should still abide with you until I have solved a question that I am turning over in my mind about the origin of the soul, I should be thankful; for I know not if any one is likely to solve it after I am gone." This wish, however, was not to be fulfilled. Towards the evening of the third day, when he could no longer speak so as to be understood, being asked by Ralph, Bishop of Rochester, if he would bestow his blessing on all who were present, together with the rest of the brethren, the king and queen, their children, and the people of the land, he raised his right hand and made the sign of the cross, then sank back with his head drooping on his chest. So they watched him through the night to the dawn of Wednesday in Holy Week. "By this time," says Eadmer, "the brethren were singing matins in the greater Church, and one of us, taking the text of the Gospels, read the Passion which was appointed to be read at mass that day. But when he came to the words, 'Ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations, and I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom,' Anselm began to draw his breath more slowly. We perceived therefore that he was about to depart, and he was taken from his bed and laid upon sackcloth and ashes; and the whole company of his spiritual sons, having collected round him, he yielded his last breath into the hands of his Creator and slept in peace." Such was the tranquil ending of the earthly life which had been so vexed and harassed by the storms of controversy and strife. It was the sixteenth year of his pontificate and the seventy-sixth of his age. His remains were buried in the Cathedral at Canterbury, next to the grave of Lanfranc, in the body of the Church in front of the great rood, but they were afterwards transferred to the chapel beneath the south-east tower which bears his name; and there they now rest.

His death, April 21, 1109.

The strife of Anselm with William Rufus had been a struggle on behalf of righteousness and just government against coarse wickedness and brutal tyranny. The contest with Henry I. was on behalf of ecclesiastical liberties. The question at issue which underlay the strife throughout was the

same for which the popes had been contending with the Emperors Henry IV. and V. from the days of Gregory VII. This question was whether the Church should be completely feudalised;—whether a bishop was the mere nominee of the sovereign, and became bound, when he did homage, to obedience and service, like a lay vassal. The battle was fought, as ecclesiastical contests often have been, over an outward custom: the practice of investiture. If the prelate received the ring and staff, the symbols of his spiritual functions, from the sovereign, it *seemed* at any rate as if the lay authority bestowed the bishopric itself, and as if the homage were done not merely for the temporalities of the see, but as a sign of absolute vassalage. By the surrender of investiture it was made clear once for all that this was not so. The Church was, thus far, detached from feudalism. Two strong kings had tried their best to hold it within the grip of feudal bonds, but they had failed. The victory of Anselm strengthened the Church to offer that resistance to the royal power in which the clergy for more than a century to come took a leading part, and helped to secure for the nation some of its most valuable constitutional rights. Occasion for resistance to papal pretensions and exactions had not yet arisen, but it was soon to come.

AUTHORITIES. — The same as in Chap. V., together with notices in Henry of Huntingdon, William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum*, William of Newburgh (all in Rolls series). Flor. of Worcester, Freeman's *Will. Rufus*, vol. ii., and *Norm. Conq.* v. 339-345.

CHAPTER VII

RIVAL POWERS: THE CHURCH, THE KING, THE POPE

After the death of Anselm the king broke the promise of his coronation charter by keeping the primacy vacant for five years, during which he confiscated the revenues of the see; but the property of the monks of Christchurch was not molested. When Henry was urged to take compassion on the widowed Church he would reply that great caution was necessary to secure an archbishop who would be a worthy successor of the great men appointed by his father and his brother. At length, in 1114, yielding to the entreaties of the bishops and clergy and the admonitions of the pope, perhaps also of his own conscience, he invited the leading men in the kingdom, clerical and lay, to a conference at Windsor. The election of Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon, was regarded as almost a certainty, being favoured by the king. He was a man of high character, and his appointment would have been entirely acceptable to the prior and monks of Christchurch. Some of the bishops, however, and other magnates thought that the office required more experience in secular affairs than a monk was likely to have, and they recommended the appointment of a royal chaplain, or the translation of a bishop. On the other hand, it was urged that from the days of St. Augustine the chief pontiffs in England had been monks, with the solitary exception of Stigand, who had wrongly intruded himself into the metropolitan see and had been rightly expelled from it. The prior and monks of Canterbury therefore proposed the election of Ralph d'Escures, Bishop of

Ralph d'Escures, Abp. of Canterbury.

Rochester. He had been Abbot of Seez in Normandy and had proved himself an able ruler of the house in troublous times. In 1100 he had been compelled to seek refuge in England from the brutal violence and oppression of Earl Robert of Bellême, and after a residence of eight years, during which he had won general confidence and esteem in the various monastic houses in which he sojourned, he had been selected by Anselm, with the approval of everybody, to succeed Gundulf in the see of Rochester. During the vacancy of the primacy he had administered the diocese, and to some extent even the province, of Canterbury. He thus fulfilled the conditions required by all parties for the archbishopric: he was a monk, a bishop, a man of experience, and withal a scholar with agreeable manners and a ready wit. He was unanimously elected by the king, the bishops, the prior and monks of Christchurch on April 26, 1114, and was enthroned at Canterbury with much splendour and rejoicing on the 18th of the following month. This election illustrates the truth of Eadmer's remark, that when Henry gave up investiture he also left the custom of his predecessors, and no longer nominated prelates at his own will.

At the suggestion of the new primate the now vacant see of Rochester was filled by the election of Ernulf, Abbot of Peterborough. A more acceptable appointment could not have been made. Ernulf had been trained at Bec, he had been the friend of Lanfranc, Anselm, and Gundulf, and was ultimately made Prior of Christchurch, Canterbury. Alike at Canterbury and Peterborough he was beloved for his gentle courteous manners, and respected for his holiness of life, his learning, and his activity in adding to the buildings and decorations of the Church. The valuable collection of documents which he made at Rochester, known as the Textus Roffensis, has earned for him the lasting gratitude of scholars.

Ernulf made Bp. of Rochester.

Archbishop Ralph proved himself an able and strenuous defender of the metropolitan rights of his see against the pope and the Archbishop of York, and on two occasions against the crown. The contest with the pope originated in connection with a request for the pall. The archbishop, who was suffering from gout, sent

The archbishop's pall.

three envoys with a letter to Pope Paschal II. praying him to send the pall by the bearers. They were received very coldly, and their request would have been refused but for the good offices of Anselm, a nephew of the late primate and abbot of St. Saba. He persuaded the pope and his councillors to let him convey the pall to England as the papal representative. At the same time the pope took the opportunity of expressing his dissatisfaction with the attitude of the English Church towards the apostolic see. Abbot Anselm was charged with a letter to the king informing him that the pope had yielded to the request that the pall should be sent, although it ought to have been fetched in person, but the concession was only made in the hope that more respect would be paid in future to the apostolic see. He complained that his letters and messengers were not received without the king's permission, that all kinds of irregularities prevailed unchecked, and that the collections of Peterpence were so negligent or so fraudulent that not half the full amount due ever reached Rome. The Prior and monks of Christchurch were also served with a letter informing them that the translation of the Bishop of Rochester to the metropolitan see without the knowledge and consent of the pope was a very serious piece of presumption, only condoned in consideration of Ralph's high reputation for learning and goodness.

Reception of the pall.

Abbot Anselm was received with much worship at Canterbury on Sunday, June 27, 1115, being met by Archbishop Ralph arrayed in pontifical robes, but barefoot, accompanied by the priors of the two convents Christchurch and St. Augustine, and a great concourse of bishops, clergy, and monks. The pall was carried by Anselm in a silver casket, deposited on the Cathedral altar, and thence solemnly taken by the primate, after he had made profession of obedience and fidelity to the pope.

Papal complaints.

Pope Paschal had not even yet delivered his final castigation of the independent spirit of the English Church. All the bishops and nobles of the kingdom were summoned by the king to a council at Westminster on September 16. There was a general belief that it was called at the instance of the new primate to confer

about measures for the reform of abuses in the Church, and the advancement of religion. But it turned out that the principal object of the meeting was to receive a letter from the pope at the hands of his messenger, Abbot Anselm, addressed to the king and the bishops. It declared that the pope, as the vicar of the Apostle St. Peter, to whom the charge was delivered, "feed my sheep," and of St. Paul, who gave the charge to Timothy, "lay hands suddenly on no man," was responsible for the appointment of fit persons to the episcopal office. It was, therefore, his duty to test the learning and character of the candidates, but the English Church defeated the discharge of this duty by appointing and translating bishops without his cognisance. He therefore warned the king and bishops that unless they recognised in future the rights of the apostolic see in these matters he should cast them off as schismatics, and surrender them to the just judgment of God.

Papal claims.

The pope's letter betrayed great displeasure and irritation; but the king on his part was equally offended by the papal claim, which he declared to be incompatible with the rights enjoyed by his father and brother. The council decided that an envoy should be sent to Rome to confer with the pope on the questions at issue, and William of Warelwast, Bishop of Exeter, so often employed during the strife with Anselm, although he was now aged and blind, was selected for the purpose.

The king offended.

The result of Bishop William's mission is not recorded, but the firm resistance offered during Henry's reign to the attempts of successive popes to overrule the Church by the agency of their legates, proves that the spirit of national independence was not subdued.

A papal legate repulsed.

In 1116 Abbot Anselm, who had brought the pall, was appointed legate by Pope Paschal for the special purpose of collecting Peterpence in England. He was armed with one letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and another to the bishops and abbots, requiring them to receive him as the vicar of the pope. Meanwhile, however, a council had been convened in London, under the presidency of Queen Matilda, in the absence of the king, who was in Normandy; and Archbishop Ralph was deputed to cross the channel and

inform the king, that in the opinion of the bishops and nobles who had composed the council, the visit of a legate without invitation was contrary to the ancient custom of the English realm. Henry, nothing loth, detained the legate at his court in Normandy, and although he treated him with great honour, he would not permit him to proceed to England.

The next attempt, which was made by Pope Calixtus, met with an equally firm resistance from the king and the primate. Peter, a monk of Cluny, was invested with a legatine commission extending over Gaul, Britain, Ireland, and the Orkneys. The king permitted him to land in England, but issued strict orders that he was not to be allowed to accept the hospitality of any ecclesiastical body. He was merely the king's private guest, who received him politely, but informed him that, owing to the pressure of the Welsh war, he had no time to consider such an important affair as the reception of a legate, inasmuch as his authority could not be exercised without the consent of the bishops, abbots, lords, and in fact the whole council of the nation. Moreover, he would by no means willingly surrender any of the customs that had been conceded to him by the apostolic see, one of the most important of which was, that during his lifetime the country should be free from all legatine authority. Possibly this promise had been obtained by the mission of William of Warelwast, referred to above. Peter the Legate, therefore, had to return by the way by which he came. He was conducted back to Dover with great pomp through Canterbury, where, at the request of the king and primate, the monks of Christchurch entertained him for three days. They took the opportunity of getting a promise from him to plead the cause of Canterbury at the papal court in the struggle which was then going on between Archbishop Thurstan of York and the primate. Then the legate departed, politely bowed out of the country, without having exercised any kind of legatine function.

Another legate dismissed.

Another question upon which the king and the primate resisted the interference of the pope, was that of the relations between the sees of Canterbury and York. On the death of Thomas, Archbishop of York, in 1114, Henry nominated

his secretary, Thurstan, to fill the vacant see. He was elected with the approval of the primate at a royal court held in Winchester, and was ordained deacon there by the bishop, William Giffard. After having been enthroned at York, he was summoned by the primate to Canterbury to be ordained priest and consecrated bishop. He knew that a profession of obedience would be demanded of him, and after consultation with his chapter, he determined to go to Rome and submit the question to the judgment of the pope. On his way, about Christmas, he had an interview with the king at Rouen, who refused to let him proceed on his journey. So he tarried for the winter in Normandy, and having been ordained priest at Bayeux, by Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, he returned to England early in the summer of 1115. At a council held by the king about Michaelmas, Thurstan complained of the delay in his consecration. Archbishop Ralph said he would willingly consecrate him if he would make profession of obedience. This, however, Thurstan refused to do, for he and the chapter of York had sent envoys to Pope Paschal II., praying him to relieve Thurstan from making the profession. Their appeal was seconded by a letter from Ivo, the learned Bishop of Chartres, and in January 1116 Paschal wrote to the York chapter, forbidding the profession to be made, and directing that the rite of consecration should be performed by the suffragan bishops of the York province, if Archbishop Ralph refused.

Thurstan, Archbishop of York.

His dispute with the primate.

The king was highly displeased at the interference of the pope, and in a council held at Salisbury, March 1116, he ordered Thurstan to make his profession or resign the archbishopric. Thurstan chose the latter alternative, but soon repented of his choice, and having accompanied the king after Easter to Normandy, he again asked leave to go to Rome, but again it was refused. Archbishop Ralph, meanwhile, had started to plead his own cause at Rome, but when he arrived there, having been delayed by illness on the way, he found that the city was in the hands of the emperor's partisans, and that the pope had withdrawn to Benevento, whither he was not disposed to follow him. Paschal, however, sent him a letter addressed to the king

Interference of the pope.

and bishop, expressing in vague terms his intention of upholding all the legitimate rights of Canterbury. The archbishop and every one must have known that such a letter meant nothing. William of Malmesbury shrewdly observes, that if the pope had expressly defined what the legitimate rights of Canterbury were, and had confirmed them, he might have moderated if not ended the strife; as it was, his language left the question undetermined. "Thus skilled," he continues, "is the cunning of the Roman pontiff in employing the artifices of the rhetorician, and keeping things in suspense by means of vain verbiage, not sparing others trouble, provided his own interests are furthered." In the following year, 1117, urged by another letter from the chapter of York, the pope wrote again to the king, requesting him to restore Thurstan to his see, and promising to adjudicate on the dispute; and in another letter to Archbishop Ralph he ordered him to consecrate Thurstan without requiring profession of obedience. Ralph, however, being detained in Normandy by illness, did not receive the letter, and although the king restored Thurstan to his see he remained unconsecrated.

In January 1118 pope Paschal died. His successor, Gelasius II., died in January of the following year. Calixtus II., who succeeded him, favoured the cause of Thurstan and enlisted the support of the king's enemies, Louis, King of France, and Fulk, Count of Anjou. Henry was anxious to get Thurstan out of the range of their influence, but could not induce him to return to England. He was summoned by the pope to a council at Reims, and Henry permitted him to go, after exacting a promise from him that he would not receive consecration from the pope. Archbishop Ralph was too unwell to attend the council, but he sent his brother Seffrid, Bishop of Chichester, with a warning to the pope from the king not to consecrate Thurstan. Nevertheless, on October 19, 1119, the day before the council, Calixtus did consecrate him in the face of a vehement protest from John, the Archdeacon of Canterbury. He was assisted by several French bishops, but the Archbishop of Lyons refused to take part in the ceremony, holding that a wrong was done to the see of Canterbury, while the English and Norman bishops who arrived the next

Thurstan consecrated by the pope, 1119.

day severely reproached both the pope and Thurstan for their deceitful conduct. Calixtus bestowed the pall upon him on November 1, but Henry declared that until he had made his profession to Canterbury he should never set foot in England.

Thurstan, however, was a skilful diplomatist, and gradually made himself so useful in negotiating terms with France, that Henry at last relented and permitted him to return to his see without making profession. Moreover, the pope had threatened to lay the country under an interdict if he was not restored. On January 30, 1121, he crossed to England, and after a friendly reception by the king and queen, he proceeded to York, where he was welcomed with great demonstrations of joy and honour. He was never compelled to make profession of obedience, but at the council of Windsor in 1126 he was not permitted to have his cross carried before him erect, or to take part in the solemn ceremony of placing the crown on the king's head.

Received into favour by the king.

On two occasions Archbishop Ralph maintained his metropolitan rights against the crown. When Bernard, one of the queen's chaplains, was elected Bishop of St. David's, it was proposed by the Count of Meulan that he should be consecrated in the king's chapel; but the archbishop refused to consecrate him anywhere but at Canterbury or Lambeth. He afterwards consented, in order to enable the queen to be present, to consecrate Bernard in Westminster Abbey, having first received his profession of obedience. The other occasion was at the marriage of the king to his second wife, Adeliza of Louvain in 1121. The ceremony was to take place at Windsor, and the speech of the archbishop being affected by a recent stroke of paralysis, it was proposed that the Bishop of Salisbury should officiate as Bishop of the Diocese. Ralph, however, would not consent, and was supported in his resistance by his suffragans. The Bishop of Winchester, therefore, was deputed to act as his representative. At the coronation of the queen on the following day, the primate having observed that the king was wearing his crown, thought that some one had usurped his right as archbishop to place it

Archbishop Ralph asserts his rights.

on the royal head, and he refused to proceed with the service until it was removed, and he had replaced it on the king's head with his own hands.

Abp. Ralph dies, 1122.

Archbishop Ralph died in 1122. The election of his successor is another curious example of a compromise between the claims of rival powers. A council called by Henry I. five months after the death of Ralph to settle the appointment of his successor was attended by bishops and lay lords, together with the Prior and some of the monks of Christchurch, Canterbury. The latter said that they were determined to elect one of their own body, and asked the king to nominate one whom he might prefer. The bishops, on the other hand, urged the appointment of a secular clerk, while the lay magnates supported the contention of the monks. The episcopal party, led by Roger, Bishop of Sarum, had most influence with the king, and in the end it was settled that the names of four secular clerks should be submitted to the monks of Christchurch, and that the one whom they selected should be appointed primate. Their choice fell on William of Corbeil. Having been originally a clerk to Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, he had abandoned this calling to become a canon regular of the order of St. Augustine, which had been recently introduced into England, and he had been made prior of a house founded for Austin canons at Chich in Essex, by Richard of Belmeis, Bishop of London.

William of Corbeil, Abp. of Canterbury.

Abp. Thurston again claims independence.

Thurstan, Archbishop of York, now made another attempt to assert his independence. He offered to consecrate the new primate, and the offer was accepted, provided he would acknowledge him as primate of all England, but to this condition Thurstan would not assent. William, therefore, was consecrated by his own suffragans, the Bishops of London and Winchester, with others. The rivalry between the archbishops was continued at Rome. William hastened there to obtain his pall, but Thurstan had arrived there before him, and prejudiced the mind of Pope Calixtus against him.

At last, however, in the words of the Chronicle, King Henry and the new primate "overcame Rome by that which

overcomes all the world—gold and silver," and the pope bestowed the pall on Archbishop William. He postponed, however, his judgment on the claims of the rival sees, and made this question, with others, a pretext for sending a legate, Cardinal John of Crema, into England. Calixtus died before the legate had started, but his commission was renewed by the succeeding pope, Honorius II., who addressed letters to the clergy and people of England, and to David, King of Scotland, commanding them to receive the legate as the vicar of St. Peter, armed with plenary authority to correct all abuses and promote religion in every possible way. The legate met the King of Scotland to settle a controversy as to the Archbishop of York's jurisdiction over the Scotch bishops, and he then went southwards. He was received with great honour by the two archbishops, but the Church and nation generally were indignant at his taking precedence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. That he should usurp the place of the primate by celebrating mass in the mother Church on Easter Day was a scandal, says Gervase, that convulsed the public mind with anger.

Cardinal John of Crema, legate.

In September, 1125, he presided at a great council at Westminster, attended by the two archbishops, twenty bishops, forty abbots and a great crowd of clergy and laity. The summons was issued by the primate and with his consent (*nostrâ conniventiâ*) on behalf of the legate, but the people generally regarded the position assumed by the legate as an insult and encroachment on the rights of the national Church. "It was a thing," says Gervase, "hitherto unheard of, that a clerk who was only of the rank of presbyter should occupy a throne above archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all the nobility of the realm." Various canons were passed in this council, simony was forbidden, and fees for chrism, baptism, penance, visitation of the sick, unction, administration of the viaticum, and burial were absolutely prohibited. Clerks holding benefices, who evaded ordination of the priesthood in order to live more freely, were to lose their benefices. No one was to be ordained deacon or priest except to a clear title. Priests, deacons, subdeacons, and canons were forbidden to have wives or concubines or any woman living in the same house with them,

The legate's assumptions resented.

except a mother or some near relation above suspicion. The legate himself was detected in a breach of this last decree during his sojourn in England, and he was subjected in consequence to so much scorn and ridicule that he was glad to sneak quietly and speedily out of the kingdom. Thus the rival claims of the two metropolitan sees were still left unsettled. The two archbishops again repaired to Rome, where Archbishop William obtained a commission for himself as legate with jurisdiction over all Britain. This was a most important event, for it set a precedent for bestowing the office of *legatus natus* on future archbishops of Canterbury. Of course this custom strengthened in one sense the hold of Rome on the English Church. It was an acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the pope. The primate shone with a reflected glory, his pre-eminence was not inherent but derivative; but, on the other hand, it prevented the frequent intrusion of foreigners as legates *a latere*, which was always resented by the nation, and generally by the sovereign, unless he wished to use papal authority in order to uphold the arbitrary exercise of his own power.

The legate departs in disgrace.

Abp. William made legate.

The primate, William of Corbeil, was not a man of such a strong character as his predecessor. Henry of Huntingdon, indeed, says that his glories could not be described because they were non-existent; but other Chroniclers represent him as a man of modest life, unaffected piety, and good education. He built the keep of the castle at Rochester, and completed the building of Canterbury Cathedral, which had been begun by Lanfranc. It was dedicated with great magnificence on May 4, 1130, the Kings of England and Scotland being present. On one occasion, owing to his weakness and complaisance, he was outwitted by the king. In 1129, when Henry had returned to England after subduing all his opponents in France, Normandy, Brittany, and Anjou, he presided at a council in London on August 1, to take measures to inforce celibacy of the clergy. The two archbishops and most of the bishops of the southern province were present. A decree was passed that all married clergy should put away their wives before St. Andrew's Day, November 30, or be deprived of their

Character of Abp. William.

benefices. The execution, however, of the decree was unwarily surrendered to the king, with the result that a large number of the clergy were permitted to redeem their wives by paying heavy fines. Thus the royal treasury was enriched, the clergy were impoverished, and the bishops, especially the primate, were discredited.

The metropolitan authority of Canterbury over the Welsh bishops was definitely established in the reign of Henry I. Urban, Archdeacon of Llandaff, was nominated to the bishopric in 1107, consecrated by Anselm at Canterbury, and made profession of canonical obedience to him. Bernard, whose consecration to the see of St. David's in 1115 has been recorded above, was the first Norman appointed to a Welsh bishopric. Hervé, made Bishop of Bangor in 1092, was a Breton. David, the successor of Hervé in 1120, was a Welshman, elected from Scotland by Griffith, Prince of Cwynedd, together with the clergy and people, but he was consecrated at Westminster and made profession of obedience to Canterbury. Hervé, who had been thrust into the see of Bangor against the will of the clergy, was not a wise or conciliatory man. His harsh rule provoked violent resistance, and at last he fled for his life to the court of Henry. In 1108 it was decided in a council at London that the vast diocese of Lincoln should be relieved by the creation of a new diocese, to include Cambridgeshire. The see was fixed at Ely, and Hervé was appointed the first bishop. Henry also formed Carlisle into a see with a chapter of Augustinian canons regular in 1133. The great Benedictine Abbey of Reading was founded by him; Cirencester Abbey, Dunstaple, and Southwyke priories, all for Augustinian canons, were also his foundations.

AUTHORITIES.—Henry of Huntingdon, Will. of Malmesb., *Gesta Pont.* and *Gesta Reg.*, *Annals of Waverly*, *Wykes and Oseney*, Symeon of Durham and Gervase of Canterbury (all in Rolls series). Flor. of Worcester (Eng. Hist. Soc.); Dugdale's *Monasticon;* Freeman's *Norm. Conq.* vol. v. pp. 148-243; Hook's *Lives of Archbisops of Canterbury*, vol. ii.

CHAPTER VIII

EVIL TIMES

HENRY I. endeavoured to secure the succession for his daughter Matilda and her offspring by exacting oaths of fealty to her on three occasions from the leading men of his dominions, both in England and Normandy. Nevertheless, from the moment of Henry's death, the succession was treated as an open question. Stephen of Blois, grandson of William the Conqueror, by his daughter Adela, and nephew of the late king, promptly seized the opportunity. He landed in Kent with a few followers. Dover and Canterbury, which were fortresses of Robert, Earl of Gloucester, half-brother of Matilda, refused him admission, but he pressed on to London, where he was elected by the citizens. There was, indeed, no one at hand who seemed so likely to prove a capable ruler. He was handsome in person and affable in manner; he had exhibited military skill as well as courage. His wife also came of a good stock, for her mother was sister to the wife of Henry I., "the Good Queen Mold."

Stephen of Blois elected king, 1135.

Stephen presently hastened, like Henry I. and William Rufus, to secure the royal city of Winchester, where the inhabitants came out to greet him, headed by his brother, Bishop Henry of Blois. The support of Henry was of great value to Stephen. The bishop made himself a kind of surety for the good treatment of the Church by his brother, and induced William de Pont de l'Arche, who was joint-treasurer with Bishop Roger of Salisbury, to surrender the royal hoard to him.

Stephen at Winchester.

Having now been elected, after a fashion, and having obtained possession of the royal treasure, Stephen only lacked the sacred rite of coronation as the divine ratification of his position. For this purpose he returned to London. The Archbishop of Canterbury, William of Corbeil, had taken the oath in 1126 to respect the succession of Matilda. He was now urged by the partisans of Stephen to recognise his election, and to perform the rite of coronation. The archbishop pleaded for delay and caution, reminding the nobles of the oaths that Henry had made them take in favour of Matilda. They replied that they were not bound by oaths taken on compulsion, and Hugh Bigot, Earl of Norfolk, declared that Henry, on his death-bed, had released them from their oaths, and disinherited Matilda. The primate then yielded and crowned Stephen, December 22, 1135, the only other bishops present being Henry of Winchester and Roger of Salisbury. Not many abbots attended, and very few nobles. Matilda appealed to the Pope Innocent II. against the claim of Stephen, but the pope acquiesced in it, if he did not actually confirm it. Accordingly in a charter issued at Oxford in the first year of his reign, Stephen describes himself as—"King, by the assent of the Clergy and People, consecrated by the Lord William, Archbishop of Canterbury and legate of the Holy Roman Church, and afterwards confirmed by Innocent, Pontiff of the Holy Roman See."

His coronation.

The archbishop had exacted an oath from him at his coronation to restore and preserve the liberties of the Church, and in his charter he promised freedom of election to the Church, that he would not do or permit anything simoniacal, that the bishops should have the right to do justice to all ecclesiastical persons, that the churches should enjoy the property unimpaired of which they stood possessed, and recover any of which they had been deprived. During the vacancy of a see the property was to be in the custody of clerks, and honest men belonging to the see. It had been the practice to seize for the king's use whatever personal property ecclesiastics left behind them. On the death of Gilbert, called "the Universal," Bishop of London, 1134, all his effects, including his boots, crammed with

His promises to the Church.

gold and silver, were conveyed to the royal exchequer. Sometimes even what a prelate had distributed on his death-bed was reclaimed for the king. These claims were finally reduced to a right on the part of the king to the cup and palfrey of a deceased bishop, abbot, or prior.

None of the promises made by Stephen in the Oxford Charter were kept, "chiefly," says William of Malmesbury, "because he hearkened to the counsels of evil-minded men, who persuaded him that he ought never to want money as long as the treasuries of the monastic houses were well filled." The primate, William of Corbeil, died in November 1136, and the see of Canterbury remained vacant for two years. During this time Stephen had involved himself in all manner of difficulties. David, King of Scotland, had taken up arms to support the cause of his niece Matilda; and rebellions in the eastern counties and in Devonshire had been suppressed with difficulty. Stephen's promises to the Church and to the lay lords had been broken. The treasury was exhausted and the coinage was debased.

The beginning of troubles.

In 1138 Alberic, Bishop of Ostia, was sent by the Pope Innocent II. as legate for England and Scotland. He went first to the north of England, where he visited Durham and Hexham, with the abbots of Molême and Fountains as his assessors. He effected a truce and an exchange of prisoners between King David and Stephen and otherwise endeavoured to mitigate the ferocity of the war. Then he went southwards and held a council at Westminster, which was attended by eighteen bishops from the two provinces, thirty abbots, and a crowd of clergy and laity.

The Papal Legate, Alberic.

The appointment of an Archbishop of Canterbury was discussed at this council, and resulted, through the influence of Stephen and his queen, Matilda, in the election of Theobald, Abbot of Bec. Bishop Henry of Winchester was deeply mortified. He had reckoned on obtaining the primacy, and indeed Orderic says that he was actually elected soon after the death of the late archbishop, but that he had failed to obtain the sanction of Pope Innocent to his translation. He dissembled his resent-

Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1139.

ment, however, and officiated with the legate at the consecration of Theobald on January 8, 1139. His wounded feelings were soon afterwards consoled by being appointed papal legate, which gave him a certain precedence in authority over the metropolitan. Theobald was a wise and wary man; he accepted the situation and patiently waited the course of events. He could afford to wait. A legatine commission expired with the pope who granted it, and Bishop Henry, conscious of the precarious tenure of the office, tried to induce Innocent to make Winchester an archiepiscopal see, with two or more suffragans to be taken out of the province of Canterbury. He was not successful in his project, although the pope is said to have actually favoured it so far as to send him a pall.

Up to this time the clergy had been Stephen's best supporters. The energy of Thurstan, Archbishop of York, had collected and stimulated the forces, which defeated the invasion of the Scots in the battle of the Standard, August 22, 1138. The three ablest and most prominent bishops were on Stephen's side, Theobald the primate, who was practically his own nominee; Henry of Winchester his brother; and Roger of Salisbury, the great justiciar, who might be supposed to carry with him his son, who was chancellor, and two powerful nephews, Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, and Nigel, Bishop of Ely, who held the important office of treasurer.

Stephen quarrels with the bishops.

Nevertheless, Stephen now committed the astonishing blunder of alienating these valuable allies. Roger of Salisbury and his nephews had, no doubt, surrounded themselves with an amount of secular pomp and power which was regarded as unseemly in bishops, and might become even a menace to the royal authority. They possessed castles of great strength and large bands of armed retainers. It was represented to the king by some of his councillors that the bishops were about to use their formidable resources in favour of the Empress Matilda, with whom they were supposed to be in treasonable correspondence. It was urged that it would be a prudent step to seize them, not indeed as bishops, but as subjects suspected of disaffection.

How far these allegations were true it is impossible to say.

It is quite conceivable, indeed, that the aged justiciar, Bishop Roger, may have repented of violating the oath that he had taken to support the daughter of the late king, his old master, to whom he owed everything, and especially after experience had proved the incapacity of Stephen. However this may have been, Stephen decided to act on the advice of his unwise councillors. In the summer of 1139 he summoned Bishop Roger to meet him at Oxford. The justiciar was very unwilling to go. "By St. Mary," he said, "my soul revolts, I know not why, against this journey; but I know I shall be of no more use in this council than a colt in a battle." His utterance clearly proves that he was conscious of having lost all influence with the king, but there is no evidence that he suspected any danger. He went to Oxford, accompanied by his son Roger the chancellor, and his two episcopal nephews. A fray between their followers and those of the Count of Meulan and Alan of Richmond, in which the nephew of the latter was nearly killed, furnished a pretext for seizing the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln, together with the chancellor. Nigel, Bishop of Ely, escaped and made his way to his uncle's impregnable castle of Devizes. Stephen followed, bringing with him the two Rogers, whom he lodged apart—the bishop in a cowshed, and his son the chancellor, whom he loaded with chains, in a hovel. Stephen threatened to hang the chancellor if the castle was not surrendered. Nigel would still have held out, but the keep was in the hands of the chancellor's mother, and the sight of her son with a rope round his neck was too much for her. The castle was surrendered, and two other castles belonging to Bishop Roger—Sherborne and Malmesbury—soon afterwards fell into Stephen's hands. Bishop Alexander was kept starving outside his own castles of Newark and Sleabury until they were given up. Nigel the treasurer, Bishop of Ely, took up arms against the king and occupied the Isle of Ely, surrounded by its inaccessible marshes and ditches. Stephen, however, by the help of a bridge of boats, and the discovery of a ford, pointed out by a monk, took the castle which guarded the entrance of the island, and the bishop then fled to Gloucester, the headquarters of Matilda's partisans.

The Bishops of Sarum and Lincoln seized.

By these acts of violence Stephen outraged public opinion, which regarded the persons of bishops as sacred, and turned the whole body of the clergy against himself, including his own brother, Henry of Winchester. Moreover the men whom he had arrested were the chief ministers of the kingdom, and their fall involved the whole country in ruin and disorder. A period of anarchy ensued, which the Chronicler, William of Newburgh, likens to the days when "there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes," or rather what was wrong. Every lord built a castle for himself, and the land was thus filled with petty tyrants, who coined their own money, levied their own taxes, did justice, or rather injustice, on their unhappy subjects, imprisoning and torturing them at their pleasure. England exhibited at this time the most glaring example of the disintegrating influence of feudalism. The writer of the English Chronicle sums up his description of the confusion and distress in the words: "Men said that Christ and his holy ones were asleep, the land seemed forsaken of God."

Anarchy.

Henry of Winchester had received the legatine commission in March 1139, but had hitherto prudently abstained from exercising it, but now neither fraternal ties, nor fear, could deter him from employing the formidable powers of his commission against the king. Having vainly endeavoured to induce him to liberate the bishops, he summoned him to answer for his conduct before a council called at Winchester on August 29. The council sat for three days. The cause of the king was pleaded by Aubrey de Vere, who charged Bishop Roger with treasonable conduct, which he vehemently denied. There were fierce altercations, and actual violence was hardly prevented by the intervention of the primate Theobald and the legate. The final judgment was in the nature of a compromise. The bishops were to surrender their munitions of war and the castles outside their own dioceses into the king's hands, and to confine themselves henceforth to their canonical duties. On the other hand the conduct of the king in laying hands upon the Lord's anointed was condemned, and he was compelled to appear before the council in the guise of a penitent, divested of his royal robes, and to receive a formal censure. Having

Council at Winchester, August 1139.

performed this act of humiliation he was exempted from any further penalties.

The king having paralysed the administration of the country and alienated the whole body of the clergy, the time had come for his rivals to strike a blow. The council of Winchester had broken up on September 1, 1139, and on the 30th of that month the Empress Matilda, with her half-brother Robert, Earl of Gloucester, landed at Arundel. Bishop Roger died in December, his illness having been aggravated, and his end hastened, by distress of mind, and with the death of the old justiciar the system of administration which he had built up under his old master Henry, the Lion of Justice, was extinguished.

The Empress Matilda arrives.

So completely had the king estranged the clergy, that only one bishop, and he a foreigner, the Bishop of Seez, attended his Whitsuntide court, 1140, which was held in the Tower of London, instead of at Westminster. On February 2, 1141, Stephen was taken prisoner by the forces of Matilda at Lincoln. Henry of Winchester had thus far supported his brother's side, but now the verdict of heaven seemed to be given decisively against him. The legate summoned a deputation of London citizens to a council at Winchester, consisting of bishops and nobles. Having justified on various grounds his past action in supporting Stephen,—the absence of Matilda when her father died, and the promises made by Stephen to the Church and nation, for the fulfilment of which he himself had stood surety,—he proceeded to show how all these promises had been shamefully violated, and that the king was now deposed by the just judgment of heaven. The throne, thus vacated, must be filled: the bishops and clergy, to whom the right of election, he said, mainly belonged, had conferred upon the matter, and their choice had fallen upon Matilda. He called on the assembly to ratify it, and to swear fealty to her as "the lady of the English." No one made any opposition; the next day the deputation from London was admitted, and after some remonstrance and petition for the liberation of the captive king, they aquiesced in the decision of the majority.

Bp. Henry of Winchester changes sides.

Matilda had her little day of power, but her arrogance soon disgusted even her own party. Bishop Henry deserted

her cause, and retired to Winchester, where he fortified his strong castle of Wolvesey in the low ground south-east of the cathedral. Matilda occupied the royal castle on the west hill, and Winchester became the scene of a sanguinary struggle between the two parties. For six years the whole country was literally torn to pieces between the opposing forces, which were very evenly matched. In addition to the petty tyranny of the owners of castles, swarms of mercenaries robbed and spoiled in every direction. Even the churches and monasteries were not safe from these marauding bands, fields were uncultivated, villages deserted. Some of the more enterprising spirits sought an escape from wretchedness at home by joining the crusaders, and the rescue of Portugal from the Moors was mainly effected by a body of English volunteers. At last the balance began to incline towards the side of the empress and her son.

Bp. Henry changes again.

The attempt of Stephen and his brother, Bishop Henry, to force their nephew William Fitz-Herbert into the arch bishopric of York in opposition to the Abbot of Fountains, Henry Murdac, who had been elected to the see, alienated the great Cistercian order. William was consecrated to York by his uncle Henry in 1143. Archbishop Theobald would not take any part in the rite. Pope Innocent died the same year, and Bishop Henry's legatine commission come to an end. Archbishop Theobald and Bishop Henry both visited Rome, the office of legate was taken away from the Bishop of Winchester by Pope Celestine II., but he does not appear to have bestowed it on the primate. The pope died in 1144, and his successor Lucius II. still withheld the legation from Bishop Henry. Eugenius III., who succeeded Lucius in 1145, threw the weight of his influence into the scale of Matilda and her son. In this policy he was guided by St. Bernard, whose influence in European politics was now paramount, and was supported by Nicholas Brakespeare, afterwards Pope Adrian IV. John of Salisbury was the confidential adviser of Nicholas, and the friend of Thomas Becket, who was secretary to Archbishop Theobald.

Death of Pope Innocent II., 1143.

The archbishop, who had hitherto refrained, except for a short period, from joining the side of Matilda out of

respect for his oath of allegiance to Stephen, was at last driven into it by the conduct of the king. He asked leave to attend a council which the Pope Eugenius had summoned at Reims in 1148. It was refused by Stephen, who suspected a plot on behalf of Matilda and her son. Theobald then went without leave. The pope suspended the English bishops who did not attend the council, including Henry of Winchester, and threatened to excommunicate the king, but the Count of Blois interceded for his brother the bishop, who was pardoned on condition of his visiting Rome in six months, and the Primate Theobald, like another Anselm, pleaded successfully for the king. Nevertheless on the return of the primate to Canterbury the king issued sentence of banishment against him, and when he had withdrawn to France the temporalities of the see were confiscated. About this time the pope conferred the legatine office on Theobald, though the precise date is uncertain, and he wrote to all the bishops directing them to demand the immediate restoration of the primate by the king, and to lay all his dominions under an interdict if he refused. The bishops, however, were now on the king's side: the interdict was published by Theobald, but was unheeded except in his own diocese, and even there it was disregarded by the prior and monks of St. Augustine's, Canterbury.

Stephen quarrels with Archbp. Theobald.

At the request of Stephen's queen, and of his confidential adviser William of Ypres, commander of the Flemish mercenaries, Theobald went to St. Omer, where negotiations were carried on with him, with the result that he was induced to return to England. Sailing from Gravelines, he landed at Gosford in the territory of Hugh Bigod, and at the earl's castle of Framlingham in Suffolk, where he was hospitably entertained, he met several lay lords, together with the Bishops of London, Norwich, and Chichester. The king was now reconciled to the primate, who took off the interdict, and the suspended prelates were reinstated with the exception of Henry of Winchester, who had failed to visit Rome within the six months prescribed by the pope. Personally, however, Theobald was reconciled to him also.

Return of Theobald to England.

The return of the primate to Canterbury was welcomed

with great joy. The prior and monks of St. Augustine's had appealed to the pope against the interdict, but Eugenius decided against them, and they had to make their submission. The services of the Church were suspended for a time, and the prior and sacristan were flogged, after which they were absolved.

The peace however between the king and the primate was but a hollow one. When he was at St. Omer Theobald had consecrated Gilbert Foliot, Abbot of Gloucester, to the see of Hereford. The see had become vacant when the council of Reims was sitting, and the pope had appointed Gilbert as vicar to administer it during the vacancy. Gilbert, who was one of the ablest and most learned scholars of the day, did homage to Stephen for his temporalities, but he heartily supported the cause of Matilda's son Henry, the young Duke of Anjou.

Gilbert Foliot.

Theobald and the able men whom he had gathered round him,—Thomas of London, the son of Gilbert Becket; Roger of Pont l'Evêque, afterwards Archbishop of York; John Belmeis, who became Archbishop of Lyons; and John of Salisbury, the primate's secretary, the foremost scholar of the day, were now all committed to the side of Henry. The ability of the young duke marked him out as well fitted for the throne. Stephen, always incapable, was now growing old, and his son Eustace, although a good soldier, had none of his father's redeeming qualities. He was harsh, insolent, and thoroughly unpopular. In the spring of 1152, Stephen held a council in London, at which he made the lay lords swear fealty to his son, and he called upon Theobald to crown him as king. Theobald refused: he had a letter from Pope Eugenius forbidding him to consecrate Eustace. The king was extremely wroth, and tried to frighten the primate and the bishops into yielding by imprisoning them all in one house. Some of the suffragans gave way; Theobald, however, was inflexible. He escaped to Flanders, upon which Stephen confiscated the estates of the see, but being threatened by the pope with excommunication and an interdict, he recalled the archbishop, who returned to Canterbury.

Theobald's great men.

Thus all the most powerful representatives of the Church, both in England and on the Continent, the pope, St. Bernard,

the Archbishop of Canterbury and his friends, were on the side of Henry. The day of power for Henry of Winchester was over. The efforts of Bishop Henry to obtain exemption from the jurisdiction of Canterbury or to erect Winchester into an archbishopric were firmly repulsed. He returned to England in September 1152, after a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James of Compostella, with a choice collection of antique statues purchased in Rome for the adornment of his palace in Winchester. Henry of Anjou landed in England in January 1153, and Bishop Henry joined with the primate Theobald and some of the nobles in mediating between the duke and the king. The death of Stephen's son Eustace in the same year left Henry of Anjou without a rival to the throne, and negotiations, begun at Wallingford, were concluded by the treaty signed at Winchester, November 1153, by which Stephen recognised Henry as his heir. They entered Winchester together, preceded by a great procession of bishops, clergy, and people, and afterwards visited London in like manner, where they were received with general acclamation and joy.

Stephen and Henry of Anjou reconciled.

For six months Henry shared in the administration of the kingdom, and worked miracles by his astonishing vigour in the suppression of the adulterine castles, and by other acts of reform. In the words of the English Chronicler, "he made such good peace as never was here." His reforms were of course resented by the lawless, and a conspiracy was formed to assassinate him, but the plot was discovered just in time to enable him to escape into Normandy.

Henry joint-ruler with Stephen.

In less than six months after his departure Stephen's restless reign of nineteen years, so full of disappointments and blunders, was ended by his death. Archbishop Theobald and the nobles having laid his body in Feversham Abbey by the side of his queen, Matilda, and his son Eustace, sent a message to Henry inviting him to come and claim his throne without delay, but owing to bad weather and other causes six weeks elapsed before he could cross the channel. During this interval, however, the archbishop maintained peace and order in England with a firm hand. Moreover, the force of character

Death of Stephen, October 25, 1154.

displayed by the young duke during his short visit had made such an impression that, in the words of the Chronicler, "no man durst do other than good for the mickle awe of him."

AUTHORITIES.—William of Newburgh, lib. i., *Gesta Stephani*, Richard of Hexham, Robert of Torigni (in vols. i. iii. iv. of the *Chronicles of Stephen and Henry*, Rolls series), with Mr. Howlett's excellent prefaces. William of Malmesbury, *Hist. Nov.*, *The English Chronicle*, Henry of Huntingdon, Gervase of Canterbury, vol. ii. (all in the Rolls series). Continuation of Flor. of Worcester (Engl. Hist. Soc.). *Historia Pontificalis*, *ap. Rer. Germ.* ss. vol. xx. ed. Pertz. For life of Archbishop Theobald, in addition to the above, John of Hexham, in vol. ii. of *Symeon of Durham* (Rolls series), *Vita Theobaldi ap. opp. Lanfranci I.*, John of Salisbury's *Polycraticus and Epistles*, and G. Foliot's *Epp.*, all three ed. Giles. For life of Bishop Henry of Blois, in addition to above, *Ann. of Winton*, *Liber de Hyda* (Rolls series), Ralph de Diceto, Peter the Venerable (Migne, pp. 189-204), *Modern writers*, Bishop Stubbs's *Select Charters*, *Const. Hist.* i., and *Early Plantagenets*, Miss Kate Norgate's *Eng. under Angevin Kings*, Round's *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, Dean Hook's *Archbishops*, vol. ii.

CHAPTER IX

HENRY II. AND THOMAS BECKET

THE reign of Henry II. was a turning-point in the history of the English nation, second only in importance to the Norman Conquest.

Henry was only twenty-two years of age at the time of his accession, yet he proved equal to the gigantic task that lay before him, which was nothing less than the reconstruction of a ruined State. He was endowed with great natural ability, and he had gained much valuable experience in the school of adversity. The vigour of his intellect and energy of his temperament were expressed in his outward form and demeanour—his large head, his thick-set frame, his eager countenance, his eyes which flashed fire when his anger was kindled, his restless activity. He was selfish, passionate, licentious, but he was not wantonly cruel or tyrannical, and he had the wisdom to see that the best way to secure a contented people was to administer just laws with a strong hand. His administrative reforms unfortunately brought him into conflict with the Church in the person of Thomas Becket; he was not less determined than William the Conqueror that the crown should be the supreme final authority in ecclesiastical matters, but he had less control over his temper than William, and he was opposed by a primate who had none of Lanfranc's sagacity and discretion.

His reign was a tragedy. A bright beginning was soon clouded by his strife with Becket, and the murder of the primate was followed by the rebellion of the king's sons. When Henry died his power and reputation in Europe were

shaken, and his heart was broken; but he had not lived in vain. The administrative reforms which he effected survived the tyranny and weakness of the reign of John and Henry III., and formed the foundation of the strong government established by Edward I.

Henry landed in Hampshire near Lymington on December 8, 1154. He was received first at Winchester, then in London with transports of joy; and was crowned at Westminster by Archbishop Theobald, on Sunday December 19. His coronation.

Henry Fitz-Empress, Duke of Normandy, Count of Anjou, Touraine, and Maine, and Duke of Aquitaine, became King of England. His first business was to surround himself with able ministers. Richard de Lucy had been appointed justiciar near the end of Stephen's reign, and he retained the office for twenty-five years under Henry, who surnamed him Richard the Loyal. Nigel, Bishop of Ely, the only survivor of the great episcopal ministers who had served Henry I., was made chancellor for a short time, and then reinstated in his old position of treasurer. Archbishop Theobald was, by virtue of his office, the first adviser of the crown, and he had been Henry's staunch supporter amidst the distractions of the late reign; but he was now aged and infirm. A sense of responsibility weighed upon his mind, especially in regard to matters affecting the Church, for Henry was neither a moral nor a religious man, and he came of a stock which had hereditary prejudices against the clergy. The primate could not accompany the young king in his rapid and incessant journeyings about his vast dominions, but he felt that it was a matter of supreme importance to bring him into contact with some one who might regulate his strong impulses and guide his mind in the right direction.

There was one man who, in the judgment not only of Theobald but of all who knew him, was eminently fitted for this duty — Thomas of London, Archdeacon of Canterbury. Theobald recommended him for the office of chancellor. His recommendation was warmly seconded by Bishop Henry of Winchester, together with the Bishops of Bayeux and Lisieux; and the king, knowing his merits, willingly appointed him, early in the year 1155. Thomas Becket, chancellor.

His early history.

Thomas Becket, as he is commonly called, or Thomas of London, as he always called himself, even after he became archbishop, was born at his father's house in Cheapside, in or about the year 1118. His father, Gilbert Becket, who came of a Norman family of knightly rank, had been a merchant at Rouen before he settled in London. Young Thomas was educated as a boy at the school of Merton Priory in Surrey, and afterwards studied at Paris up to the age of twenty-two, when he was compelled to return to England to earn his own living, his father being aged and reduced from affluence to poverty. He found employment as clerk to a kinsman, Osbern Huitdeniers, or Eightpenny, as he might be called in English, who was one of the sheriffs of London.

Two of Archbishop Theobald's clerks, who had once been guests in the house of Gilbert Becket, introduced Thomas to the primate. He quickly recognised his ability, and added him to the number of clever young men whom he trained up in his household. He soon became one of Theobald's most confidential friends and counsellors. He accompanied him to Rome in 1143, when he went to try and obtain the legatine commission, and to the council of Reims in 1148, and the refusal of Theobald to crown Stephen's son, Eustace, was largely due to his influence. He was only in minor orders at this time, and his habits and tastes were not clerical; but, after the custom of the age, he was remunerated for secular services with ecclesiastical preferment. In 1143 he held the livings of St. Mary-le-Strand, London, and Otford, Kent; in 1154 he was made prebendary of Lincoln and of St. Paul's, and finally, having been ordained deacon, he had been preferred to the archdeaconry of Canterbury, the most dignified and lucrative post, next to that of a bishop or abbot, in the Church of England.

His career as chancellor.

The new chancellor was a striking and commanding figure —tall, well-made, handsome, dignified, with eyes singularly bright and piercing. He could not fail to be popular, for he spent much of his great wealth in bountiful almsgiving and splendid hospitality. Technically the chancellor ranked below the justiciar and the treasurer, but as chief secretary to the sovereign, keeper of

the royal seal, custodian of vacant benefices, and superintendent of the royal chaplains and clerks, he was brought into closer personal contact with the king than any other official, and wielded very great power.

Between Henry and his chancellor there grew up the closest intimacy. They were of one heart and of one mind. "Who knows not," writes Peter, Abbot of Celle, to Thomas, "that thou art second only to the king in the four realms." Henry frequently visited his chancellor. Sometimes on his return from hunting, when the chancellor was dining with guests, the king would suddenly burst into the room, vault over the table, seat himself beside the host, and after taking a few mouthfuls of food, and tossing off a glass of wine, would remount his horse and ride away. The king consulted him on all affairs of State, and if most of the administrative reforms were devised by Henry himself, the chancellor was his most trusted agent in carrying them into effect. He combined indeed the qualities of lawyer, diplomatist, and soldier. In 1156 he acted as justice-itinerant in three counties; in 1157 he was trying the question of the rights of Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, over Battle Abbey. The following year he acted as ambassador to the court of the French king, Louis VII., to arrange a marriage between his daughter and Henry's eldest son, when the splendour of his retinue was such that the French exclaimed, "If this is the chancellor, what must the king himself be!" In the war with Toulouse he was foremost in every battle, at the head of a body of picked knights, and for some time he successfully defended the Norman frontier against the French with troops which he maintained at his own cost. But however secular the tone of his life, it was unsullied by vice. Impurity and dishonesty were abhorrent to him. His moral uprightness in an immoral court, while it earned him the respect of many, provoked the malice of others, and there were times when he longed for retirement from the world.

By the year 1159 the older generation of bishops was dying out. Richard of London was stricken with paralysis. Henry of Winchester had retired to Cluny. The sees of Worcester, Exeter, and Lichfield were vacant. Archbishop Theobald's life was drawing to an end. The king and the chancellor were absent in Normandy.

Abp. Theobald's last days, 1161.

The aged primate longed to see them both, more especially the chancellor, "the foremost of my counsellors, nay, my only one," as he pathetically calls him. He wrote letters urging his return, saying that he was anxious to confer with him about the future both of the Church and State. From John of Salisbury we learn that there were many corruptions and abuses which demanded redress; miscarriage of justice in the secular and ecclesiastical courts, bribery and extortionate fees, high spiritual offices purchased by worldly men, not indeed with money, but through court interest. Theobald felt that the destiny of the Church and nation depended largely upon the chancellor, who was already the chief adviser of the king; and he was anxious that his influence should become yet more paramount by his elevation to the primacy of all England. Theobald's desire, however, to see the king and Thomas was not gratified. Henry was detained in Normandy by hostilities with France, and he either could not, or would not, part from his chancellor. In April 1161 the archbishop was carried into his chapel at Canterbury to witness the consecration, at which he was too feeble to officiate, of Richard Peche to the bishopric of Lichfield, and on the 18th of the same month he was called to his rest.

Thomas Becket made abp., 1162.

For more than a year after Theobald's death Thomas was detained by the king in Normandy. Then he was despatched to England to settle various affairs of State, together with the justiciar and other officials, taking with him the king's young son Henry, who had been entrusted to his care. On the eve of his departure the king told him that he intended to make him Archbishop of Canterbury. Thomas treated the announcement as a jest. "A religious and holy man truly dost thou seek to place in that holy seat, and to set over that holy community of monks; but know for a surety that if by divine providence thy wish should come to pass, the good-will that is now so strong between us will soon be changed into the bitterest hatred. In sooth I know that thou wilt exact some things, and art designing many in ecclesiastical affairs, which I could not calmly tolerate, and envious men will seize the opportunity of a breach in our friendship to stir up lasting enmity." The king, however, persisted in his purpose, and the justiciar

Richard de Lucy was instructed to see that it was carried into effect. Accordingly, soon after his arrival in England he went to Canterbury, accompanied by three bishops—Bartholomew of Exeter, Hilary of Chichester, and Walter of Rochester—and urged the monks of Christchurch, as they valued the good of the Church and their own peace, to acquiesce in the wish of the king and to elect Thomas to the primacy. There was at first much division of opinion in the chapter; some resented the appointment of a State official at the bidding of the king, especially a man who was distinguished as a soldier and a sportsman rather than as a clerk. To make such an one, they said, the chief pastor for all England would be like setting a wolf to guard a sheepfold. Finally, however, the justiciar's arguments prevailed, and Thomas was unanimously elected.

On May 23 a great council of bishops and clergy was held at Westminster, where the election was repeated with only one dissentient voice—that of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford, who pronounced him unfit for the high office because he had persecuted the Church; referring probably to the great scutage said to have been devised by the chancellor. "My son," said Bishop Henry of Winchester, turning to Thomas, "if thou hast been as Saul the persecutor, be thou henceforth as Paul the apostle." The election was confirmed by the great officers of State, together with the young Henry, who acted as the formal representative of the king. On Saturday in Whitsun week Thomas was ordained priest by Walter, Bishop of Rochester, and on the following day (June 3, 1162) he was consecrated archbishop by Henry of Winchester (the Bishop of London having recently died), assisted by thirteen bishops of the province. As he mounted the patriarchal chair a shout of applause rang through the church, but his eyes were downcast and tearful, for his heart was filled with sad forebodings of trouble and sorrow. Envoys were sent to Pope Alexander III. at Montpellier to convey the new archbishop's profession of fealty, and to ask for the pall, which was sent. Before the act of consecration Bishop Henry had led the primate-elect to the entrance of the choir, and there received from the young Henry and the justiciar a formal

His consecration.

release in the king's name from all secular obligations. All danger of future trouble in this connection would thus, it was hoped, be obviated; but the hope proved to be a vain one.

The new archbishop promptly resigned the office of chancellor, and therewith laid aside all the secularity of his former life. He put off the old man and was transformed into a new creature. He was diligent in prayer, in study of the Holy Scriptures, and in preaching; he subdued the flesh by all manner of austerities; he wore a hair shirt next his skin, which was never taken off even when it swarmed with vermin; he rarely ate meat or drank wine; he often subjected his back to the scourge. In obedience to a vision he assumed the habit of a monk, and he wore his stole, the symbol of Christ's yoke, day and night. Theobald had been liberal in almsgiving, but Thomas doubled the amount. Either by himself or a deputy the feet of thirteen poor men were daily washed, and more than a hundred were fed from his table. He was still splendid in his hospitality, but the actors, the jesters, the jongleurs, the singers who formerly thronged his hall were now banished from it; the laymen whom he entertained sat at a table by themselves, where they fared sumptuously, while he himself ate sparingly of simple food, surrounded by his clerks and his learned men (*eruditi*), and listening to the reading of some sacred book by his cross-bearer, a duty assigned by ancient custom to that official. After dinner he retired with his "eruditi" to his private chamber, where some passage in Holy Scripture or some practical question was discussed. He often bewailed his past neglect of the Bible, and eagerly seized every opportunity of making up for it. Sometimes even on a journey he would slacken the pace of his horse, draw a book out of one of his wide sleeves, and with the help of his confidential friend, Herbert of Bosham, discuss some part of its contents. When he was at Canterbury he loved to sit in some quiet corner of the cloisters reading amongst the brethren. In celebrating mass he was often moved to tears, and he did not dare to officiate every day, quoting the words of the centurion, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof."

His changed character.

From the time of his appointment everything tended to bring about a rupture with the king. Henry had expected to find in him the same useful counsellor and agent in secular administration as before, only strengthened by his position as metropolitan. He was annoyed by his resignation of the chancellorship, and by his complete withdrawal from all affairs of State. The vigour with which the archbishop set to work to recover all property of the see that had been alienated or let on lease stirred up a host of adversaries, who carried their complaints to the king and did their best to prejudice him against the primate, whom they represented as proud, grasping, and even as dangerous to the royal dignity and authority. At the close of the year 1162 Henry set out for England, being determined to inquire in person into the proceedings of the archbishop. Having spent Christmas at Cherbourg, he landed at Southampton on St. Paul's day, January 25, 1163. There Thomas met him with young Henry; there was a cordial greeting between the king and the primate, and they travelled to London together. On the way the king requested Thomas to resign the archdeaconry of Canterbury, which he had now held, together with the primacy, for six months; he remonstrated, but yielded, and the old friends parted on good terms.

Beginning of troubles.

At the suggestion of Thomas, Gilbert Foliot was translated from the see of Hereford to London, where he was enthroned at St. Paul's on April 28, 1163. He stepped into the place, hitherto occupied by Thomas, of confidential adviser to the king, for which he was well qualified by his ability. This duty, indeed, was enjoined upon him in a letter from the pope, and was recognised by Thomas in a letter to Foliot congratulating him on his appointment. He was soon to become one of the archbishop's most determined adversaries, but as yet the tone of their correspondence was cordial.

Gilbert Foliot, Bp. of London.

The first rupture between the king and the primate turned upon a purely secular question. It was a custom of long standing that two shillings should be paid annually to the sheriff of each county upon every hide of land. This charge or rate, called the sheriff's aid, was a local payment to the sheriffs for their services. In a

First dispute with the king.

council held at Woodstock, July 31, 1163, the king announced that he intended to have the whole of the amounts thus levied paid direct into the exchequer as part of the royal revenue. The archbishop opposed the change, representing, no doubt, the popular feeling. The people preferred a local rate payable to the sheriffs for useful work in the county, to a direct tax payable to the crown. "Saving your good pleasure, my lord king," said the archbishop, "we will not pay this money to you, for it is not yours; we will not fail to pay it to the sheriffs as long as they and their agents serve us worthily." The king, astounded and angry, swore by God's eyes that the money should be entered amongst the crown revenues. "Then, by those same eyes," retorted the primate, "not one penny shall you have from my lands, or from the lands of the Church." Whether the king or the archbishop prevailed is not recorded, but in any case the action of the archbishop was an important event in English constitutional history, being the first assertion, since the Norman conquest, of the right of the national council to withhold money as well as to grant it.

This incident was soon followed by another, which increased the irritation of the king. William of Eynesford, a tenant-in-chief of the crown, claimed the right of presenting to one of the archbishop's livings. Thomas promptly excommunicated him, regardless of the established custom which required the king to be consulted before any of his tenants-in-chief were subjected to spiritual penalties. Henry demanded the withdrawal of the sentence. Thomas refused, saying that it was not for the king to decide who should be bound by spiritual penalties, or who should be loosed from them. After a time, indeed, the archbishop took off the excommunication, but too late to mollify the anger of the king. The dispute was a clear indication of an impending conflict between the rights of the Church and the crown.

The second dispute.

The ill effects of the separation made by William the Conqueror between the ecclesiastical and secular courts were now beginning to be felt. Owing partly to the development of the canon law, partly to the collapse of the civil administration in Stephen's reign, an increasing mass of business had been drawn into

The third dispute.

the Church courts. The only penalties which these courts could inflict were various forms and degrees of penance, suspension from office, or at the worst deprivation and excommunication. Any one designated a clerk might be tried in the Church courts, and the term clerk included all who served the Church in any capacity, as an acolyte, for instance, doorkeeper, or singing man. The consequence was that many ill-conditioned men, by obtaining some low clerical office, or perhaps by simply declaring themselves clerks, eluded the penalties due to flagrant crimes of violence, robbery, or even murder. Henry found his efforts to establish good order in England after the anarchy of Stephen's reign seriously thwarted by this state of things. His justiciars, indeed, informed him that in the nine years since his accession more than one hundred murders, besides countless lesser offences, had been committed by so-called clerks. He had counted upon the assistance of his former chancellor in devising some remedy for this abuse; but he soon discovered that in the new archbishop he had to reckon with a vehement opponent. A clerk, one Philip de Broi, having been tried for murder in the Bishop of Lincoln's court, was acquitted, after clearing himself by a legal compurgation. The king required the case to be retried before one of his justices in eyre in Bedfordshire. The culprit refused to plead, and poured forth abuse upon the judge, who thereupon laid a complaint of the indignity before the king. Henry was enraged, and swore by his favourite oath (God's eyes) that the offender should be tried both for the homicide and for contempt of court. Becket insisted that the trial should take place in his own court, and to this the king was obliged to consent. On the charge of murder the acquittal of the former court was upheld: for the insult to the judge the clerk was sentenced to be scourged and to forfeit all his income for two years, to be bestowed in alms at the king's pleasure.

Henry, however, was not satisfied; other cases of the like kind occurred, increasing his irritation. It was of little use for the archbishop to inflict severe penalties now and then; what the king wanted was the establishment of his own right to deal with criminal clerks in the ordinary course of justice.

On October 1 he brought the question before a great council at Westminster. He enlarged upon the grievous injury to the public peace that resulted from the existing conditions. He demanded that the bishops should be more vigorous in prosecuting criminous clerks, and that when the offenders had confessed, or been convicted of, their guilt in the bishop's court, and had been degraded they should then, having become laymen, be subject to the penalties of the secular court. Such, he contended, had been the custom in his grandfather's days, and all that he asked was that it should remain in force. He argued with good reason that degradation from his sacred office would not deter a clerk from repeating a crime which reverence for his office had not originally deterred him from committing.

Council of Westminster, 1163.

The archbishop and bishops, on the other hand, after a long discussion in private, maintained that the custom was an innovation and an infringement of canon law, which forbade the trial of clerks in secular courts, a prohibition based on the teaching of Holy Scripture. Joab and Abiathar the priest had been guilty of the same crime in putting Adonijah to death; but while Joab was executed, Abiathar had been only deposed from his office. They quoted Nahum i. 9 (Septuagint version), God does not give two judgments on the same matter. To subject clerks to double penalties would abase them too much before the laity. All that the bishops would concede was, that if a clerk, who had been degraded by the Church court for some crime, committed it again, he should then be handed over as a mere layman to the secular court. The king, still dissatisfied, demanded unconditional acquiescence in the ancient custom; but the bishops would only promise submission "saving their order." Henry waxed furious, and abruptly quitted the assembly without giving or receiving any salutation. The next day it was found that he had gone from London; the archbishop was summoned to surrender some of the castles which he had held from the time that he was chancellor, and soon afterwards the young Henry was removed from his guardianship.

A private conference between the king and the archbishop, held on horseback near Northampton, proved fruitless. Some of the more pliable bishops, however, Roger, Arch-

bishop of York, Robert of Lincoln, and Hilary of Chichester were persuaded to accept the customs on the strength of the king's assurance that the rights of their order should in no wise be infringed; and about Christmas, the Abbot of Aumone and the Earl of Vendome having arrived with letters purporting to be from the pope who counselled submission for the peace of the Church, Becket was induced to meet the king at Woodstock, and promised to observe the customs loyally and in good faith; being assured that the king had pledged his word to the pope that he had no designs against the privileges of the clergy.

Henry now required that the archbishop's promise should be repeated in public before an assembly of bishops and lay lords, which was convened at Clarendon, a royal hunting-seat near Salisbury, about the middle of January 1164. At this council Thomas was required to declare his assent to the customs. He hesitated: the king was seized with one of those paroxyms of rage to which he was liable, and which terrified all beholders; the bishops cowered, the archbishop alone remained calm and firm. At last, on the third day, the tearful entreaties of the Bishops of Salisbury and Norwich, the threats of the Earls of Cornwall and Leicester that they would have to employ force by the king's command, and the solemn assurances of two knights-templars, that the king had no sinister designs on the clergy, induced the archbishop to give way. He promised that he would loyally obey the customs, and he required his suffragans to do likewise. It was, however, only a general promise to observe what had not as yet been clearly defined. The king therefore appointed a committee of barons, qualified by wisdom and experience, to investigate the customs and reduce them to writing. As the result of their deliberations, which lasted nine days, the customs were embodied in the form of sixteen articles, which came to be known as the "Constitutions of Clarendon."

Council of Clarendon, 1164.

These famous Constitutions had a most important bearing, not only upon the points in immediate dispute between the king and the archbishop, but generally upon the relations between Church and State, and the ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions in England. By article i. disputes about advowsons and presentations to

The Constitutions of Clarendon.

churches, between laymen or clerks, were to be decided in the king's court.

By article iii. clerks accused of any crime, having been summoned by the king's justiciar, should come into his court to make answer there for what as it shall appear to the king's court they ought to make answer there; and in the ecclesiastical court they should make answer concerning that for which they ought to make answer; the justiciar should also send some one to the ecclesiastical court to see how the matter was dealt with there. If the clerk confessed or was convicted in the Church court, the Church ought not any longer to protect him.

This third article seems to lay down the course of proceeding which Henry had already tried to enforce in the case of Philip de Broi. A clerk accused of such a crime as homicide, being an offender against both secular and canon law, was to be summoned in the first instance to plead (*respondere*) in the king's court. Then, without any trial, he was sent to plead (*respondere*) in the Church court. If he confessed, or was convicted there, he would be degraded, and the Church could then protect him no more. He was to be remitted to the king's court to be dealt with there like a layman, and to suffer the secular penalties of mutilation, or death as the case might be.

The dispute between the king and Becket hinged upon the latter part of this article. The more compliant bishops were willing to accept it. It seemed to them not unreasonable that when a clerk had been degraded he should be treated as a layman. Thomas, on the other hand, declared it to be contrary to the canon law—"Deus non judicat bis in id ipsum": in other words, the judgment of the Church court was to be final.

By article iv. archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries could not quit the realm without the king's license; and when permitted to go must give security that neither in going, returning, or sojourning abroad, would they seek to do any damage to the king or kingdom.

By article vii. no tenant-in-chief of the king, nor any of the officials on his estates, could be excommunicated, or his lands placed under interdict, unless the king, or in his absence

the justiciar, was first approached, in order that justice might be done. What pertained to the king's court was to be settled there, after which what concerned the Church court should be remitted to be dealt with there.

By article viii. appeals in ecclesiastical causes were to lie from the archdeacon to the bishop, and from the bishop to the archbishop; and in default of justice in the archbishop's court recourse was to be had finally to the king, who was to order the suit to be determined in the archbishop's court, beyond which it was not to go without the assent of the king.

By article xii. the revenues of vacant archbishoprics, or bishoprics, or of an abbey or priory, if they were the king's demesne, were to be in his hands. The election was to be made in the king's chapel by the chief persons of the church, with his assent, and the advice of the leading men of the kingdom.

By article xvi. the son of a villein was not to be ordained clerk without the assent of his lord.

The Constitutions were really a codification of usages which had existed in the days of William the Conqueror and Henry the First. Some of them were developments or expansions of these customs so as to meet the particular requirements of the time, but the main intention of them clearly was to prevent friction and strife between the ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction by defining the respective limits of each. They were only a part, although a most important part, of the great scheme of administrative reform by which Henry was endeavouring to re-establish law and order after the violence and confusion of Stephen's reign.

Their nature and aim.

Thomas chose to regard them rather as conceived in a spirit of direct hostility to the Church and designed to humiliate and depress the whole clerical order, and he accordingly offered the most strenuous opposition to them. As each article was read to the council he rose and stated his objections to it. When the recital was ended the king called upon the bishops to attach their seals to the document. The narratives of Becket's biographers at this point are not quite clear or consistent. According to some he cried, "Never, while there is any breath left in my

Attitude of Becket.

body;" others, including his intimate friend Herbert of Bosham, say that he asked time for deliberation for himself and the bishops, taking a copy of the Constitutions with him for that purpose. William Fitz Stephen says that he sealed the document, but this statement is at variance with all the other Chroniclers, and with his own report of two speeches made afterwards at Northampton, one by Thomas the other by Hilary of Chichester, who both declared that none of the bishops sealed. All that can certainly be said is that Thomas did commit himself to some kind of assent, and straightway repented and retracted it.

Accompanied by Herbert of Bosham he took his way to Winchester after the council. As they rode along he uttered not a word until his companion inquired the cause of his unwonted silence and dejection. Then he poured forth bitter self-reproaches: "he had betrayed the Church through his feebleness and cowardice; but such conduct was the natural result of putting one who had been bred in the court not in the cloister into such an exalted position, turning a keeper of hawks into a keeper of sheep, a follower of actors and hounds into a shepherd of souls; God had forsaken him and he must be deposed from his sacred office." These passionate utterances of remorse were choked by sobs, and the efforts of his friend to console him were of little avail. He went into retirement at Winchester, and suspended himself from all priestly functions, awaiting absolution from the pope.

His remorse and dejection.

Meanwhile difficulties and dangers thickened around him. The king's brother, William of Anjou, had died the day before the conclusion of the council of Clarendon. His death was attributed to a broken heart because Becket had forbidden him to marry the widowed Countess of Warenne, on the ground of affinity. The king was thoroughly incensed against the archbishop; some of his most intimate friends were not permitted to associate with him. Roger Pont l'Eveque, Archbishop of York, began to revive the old claim of his see to independence, and the king was supporting it at the papal court.

Presently a fresh cause of dispute arose. John the king's marshal had some claim against the archbishop in connection

with his manor of Pagham in Sussex. Alleging on oath that he could not obtain justice in the archbishop's court he transferred his suit to the king's court. Thomas being cited to appear sent messengers to say that he was too unwell to attend, and to protest against the removal of the suit, asserting that John had taken the oath on a "troparium,"[1] which he had secretly substituted for a copy of the gospels. The king disbelieved these statements, and called a great council to meet at Northampton, at which Thomas was required to appear on the first day to answer the claim of John the marshal. He was not invited according to custom by a special writ, but cited through the Sheriff of Kent.

Another dispute.

The council, which was opened on Wednesday October 7, was attended by nearly all the bishops as well as the lay tenants-in-chief. When Thomas met the king he offered him the customary kiss, but it was rejected. A request to go to Rome to consult the pope about the dispute with Roger of York and other matters was angrily refused. The next day, October 8, he was tried for contempt of the recent summons to appear in the king's court, and was condemned to pay a fine of 500 pounds. At first the bishops demurred to this sentence, but finally acquiesced in it. The king went on to demand 300 pounds as due to him for the manors of Eye and Berkhamstead, which Thomas had held when he was chancellor; together with the repayment of a loan of 1000 marks. To these demands the archbishop, though deeply mortified, submitted, being unwilling to contend about questions merely of money. But when the king further required a complete statement of the revenues of sees, baronies, and honours of which, when he was chancellor, Thomas had the custody during vacancies, his fortitude gave way. He flung himself at the king's feet, and the bishops did the same, imploring him not to press this last demand. But Henry was inexorable; he swore by God's eyes that the account should be rendered in full. A day's respite, however, was granted. The archbishop consulted with his suffragans. Henry of Winchester tried to induce

Council of Northampton.

[1] A book of words and music that were introduced into some parts of the mass.

the king to accept as a compromise 2000 marks in discharge of all claims, but in vain; nor would he listen to the plea that Thomas had been formally released on the day of his consecration from all secular obligations. Gilbert Foliot and the bishops generally advised unconditional surrender; but Thomas now took a high line.

The demand, he said, was illegal and unjust; if the bishops took any further part in the trial he should appeal to Rome, and he charged them to excommunicate any layman who should dare to sit in judgment upon him. This answer they carried to the king. They only succeeded in getting the matter adjourned to Monday. On Monday Thomas was too unwell to move. On Tuesday morning, in the chapel of the little monastery of St. Andrew, where he was lodged, he celebrated the mass for St. Stephen's Day with the introit, "Princes did sit and speak against me;" and after mass he rode to the castle hall with a single attendant, who carried his cross. At the gate he took it into his own hands and entered the hall bearing it aloft. The assembly gazed upon him with astonishment and dismay. Presently the bishops gathered round him, they tried to persuade him to lay down the cross, some even attempted to wrest it from him by force: it would be regarded, they all said, by the king as a sign of defiance. But Thomas steadfastly refused to part with it. "The cross," he said, "is a symbol of peace, not of war, and the king ought to be pacified rather than offended, if I hold the cross of his Master and mine in my hands." The bishops grew impatient. Henry of Winchester and Hilary of Chichester urged him to resign the archbishopric. "Would," cried Hilary, "that you would become Thomas and continue to be Thomas only." But their arguments were vain. "A fool," said the sarcastic Gilbert Foliot, "thou ever wast, and a fool, I see, thou wilt be to the end."

Conduct of the bishops.

At last all the bishops withdrew from him, and he was left without any companion but his two faithful friends, William Fitz-Stephen and Herbert of Bosham. The king, who was in an inner chamber, was enraged when he heard in what fashion the primate had entered the hall, and he proclaimed him to be a traitor. A confused and threatening murmur arose in the assembly.

Becket deserted.

Thomas began to think his life in danger. A royal marshal forbade any one to speak to the traitor. William Fitz-Stephen caught his master's eye and silently pointed to the cross.

After a conference with the bishops Henry sent his final message to the archbishop. He was to withdraw his appeal to Rome and his commands to the bishops, which were contrary to the customs that he had sworn to observe, and he was to submit to the judgment of the king's court on the chancery accounts. With eyes fixed on the cross Becket firmly rejected these demands. The king being informed of his refusal flew into one of his violent and terrible fits of fury, but after he had cooled down he accepted a proposal made by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Chichester, that Thomas should be cited before the pope for perjury at Clarendon, and for illegally commanding his suffragans to disobey the Constitutions which he had formerly ordered them to observe. Meanwhile the lay lords passed sentence upon him for contempt of the royal jurisdiction, and the old justiciar, Robert, Earl of Leicester, entered the hall to pronounce it. "Hear," he said, the judgment which has been passed upon thee in the king's court." At the word judgment Thomas sprang to his feet, and with his cross uplifted, and flashing eyes, he bade the justiciar be silent, seeing that he had solemnly appealed to the protection of the papal court. Then cross in hand he strode out of the hall. While the bishops gazed at him in speechless amazement the courtiers loaded him with insults and abuse. One of them shouted "traitor." "Were I a knight," replied the primate, "instead of a priest, this hand should prove thee liar." Through the crowd of revilers he made his way to the castle yard, mounted his horse, and taking up Herbert of Bosham behind him, rode forth. Outside the castle the jeers and insults of his enemies were exchanged for the salutations of a sympathising crowd of poor folk, who fell down before him to crave his blessing.

The final scene.

Fearing that the king would refuse him a safe-conduct to Canterbury he determined to depart secretly. He had his bed laid in the church of the monastery. At dawn the monks chanted matins in an undertone not to disturb his slumbers, but there was no need for the

Becket's flight.

precaution; the bed was empty. In the dead of night, and under cover of a violent storm of rain, which increased the darkness, and deadened the sound of the horses' tramp, Thomas had departed, accompanied by two canons of Sempringham, and a faithful squire, Roger of Brai. They made their way to Lincoln, where the primate was lodged in the house of a friend of one of his companions. Having assumed the garb of a lay brother he was conveyed by boat down the river to an island belonging to the house of Sempringham, where he remained concealed for some days. Thence, travelling generally by night, he reached Sandwich and crossed the channel in a small vessel to Flanders. He remained there in hiding for a fortnight, and then proceeded to the French court at Soissons, where he was cordially welcomed by King Louis. From Soissons he pressed on to Sens, where Pope Alexander was then residing. The Archbishop of York with the Bishops of London, Exeter, Worcester and Chichester, had arrived at Sens before him, as advocates of the king in the appeal to the pope; but they had met with a very cold reception. Thomas submitted the Constitutions of Clarendon to the pope. After discussion in a full consistory six of them were pronounced tolerable, the remainder were solemnly condemned.[1] Henry's envoys returned to England on Christmas eve and reported to the king the failure of their mission. On St. Stephen's day he confiscated all the property of the archbishop's see, of the archbishop himself,

[1] The articles tolerated by the pope were (ii.) that churches in fee of the king could not be granted in perpetuity without his consent. (vi.) That laymen should not be accused in an ecclesiastical court except by regular lawful accusers and witnesses in the presence of the bishop, and if no one was willing or dared to accuse them, the sheriff on the requisition of the bishop could summon a jury of twelve lawful men of the neighbourhood, who should be sworn to give true evidence. (xi.) That prelates and all tenants-in-chief of the crown should hold their possessions of the king as a barony, and discharge all royal dues and customs like other barons, and attend trials in the king's court, only withdrawing when the sentence involved mutilation or death. (xiii.) That if any of the magnates of the realm failed to do justice in any matter to the archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon, the king should bring them to justice, and in like manner if any failed to do right to the king, the archbishop, bishop, and archdeacon should bring him to justice. (xiv.) That goods forfeited to the king might not be detained in church or churchyard against the king's justice, inasmuch as they were his property whether found in the church or outside it. (xvi.) That the sons of villeins should not be ordained without the consent of the lord.

and of his clerks; and not content with these harsh measures, he had the cruelty and meanness to order all his kinsfolk and dependents to be expelled from the kingdom.

AUTHORITIES.—*Materials for the history of Thomas Becket*, seven volumes in Rolls series, ed. by Rev. J. C. Robertson. These contain the contemporary lives by William of Canterbury, John of Salisbury, Edward Grim, William Fitz-Stephen, Herbert of Bosham, and two anonymous writers, together with a large collection of letters from the pope, the king, Becket himself, John of Salisbury, Gilbert Foliot, and others. Also contemporary is *Vie de St. Thomas*, in French verse, by Garnier de Pont Sainte-Maxence, ed. Hippeau, Gervase of Canterbury, Ralph de Diceto, William of Newburgh (Rolls series); the latter writer is remarkably discriminating in his estimate of Henry II. and Thomas Becket. Amongst modern works the most noteworthy are Bp. Stubbs's Preface to *Rog. of Howden*, vol. ii. (Rolls series), and *The Early Plantagenets*; see also his *Select Charters* and *Constit. Hist.*, ch. xii. and xiii.; Miss K. Norgate's *England under the Angevin Kings*, vol. ii. ch. i.; E. A. Freeman's *St. Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers* (Historical Essays, first series); Hook's *Archbishops*, vol. ii.; *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, by Professor Maitland, who has thrown much light on the real meaning of Article iii. in the Constitutions of Clarendon.

CHAPTER X

THE MURDER AND AFTER

THE tangled story of the strife between Henry and Archbishop Thomas during the next six years can be recorded here only in outline. With the exception of the archbishop himself, nearly all the actors in the drama were embarrassed by conflicting interests and duties. The English bishops were distracted between their twofold allegiance, to the king and to the archbishop. Most of them, under the leadership of the cautious and astute Bishop of London, Gilbert Foliot, considered that the primate was contending for a right cause but in a wrong way, wrecking his chances of success by his intemperate vehemence, driving the king to extreme measures of retaliation, and urging him into the party of the emperor and the antipope. The pope could not decently reject the appeal of Becket, but hampered as he was by his own strife with the emperor, he could not afford to quarrel with the king of England, the lord of half France, so his policy was wavering and shifty. To Louis, King of France, the quarrel became a convenient handle for directing popular feeling against his rival, and fomenting discord and disaffection in Henry's vast and scattered dominions which he always found it difficult to hold firmly together. The emperor, on the other hand, saw an opportunity of cultivating alliance with Henry, and arranged a marriage between his cousin, Henry the Lion Duke of Bavaria, and the eldest daughter of the English king.

Complexity of interests.

Thomas never deviated from the course upon which he had entered. Smarting under a sense of remorse for having

yielded too much, he was now resolved to yield nothing. The liberty and life of the Church seemed to him to be at stake. Compromise was abhorrent to him; concession, which some might have regarded as only statesmanlike prudence, he would have disdained as a base betrayal of a sacred trust. Whatever may be thought of the wisdom of his conduct, it had at least the merit of being straightforward, honest, courageous. It was this singleness of aim, this disinterested devotion, as it was believed, to the cause of liberty, which captivated the popular imagination and won the popular sympathy during the archbishop's life, and when his long struggle was ended by a violent death, created an enthusiasm for the hero and martyr which has rarely been equalled.

Becket's singleness of aim.

Thomas having retired to the Cistercian monastery of Pontigny, addressed letter after letter to Henry of mingled entreaties, warnings, and threats, asking for an interview, or demanding the restoration to the English Church of her privileges and her chief pastor; else the sword of the Church would be unsheathed against his kingdom, and even against his own person. Driven to extremity, Henry by the advice of Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux, resolved to appeal to the pope, thus inconsistently adopting a practice which by the Constitutions of Clarendon he had endeavoured to restrain. The Bishops of Lisieux and Seez were despatched to Pontigny to stay Thomas from executing his threats, pending the appeal. But they were too late. After a pilgrimage to Soissons, where he spent three nights in vigils and prayers before the shrines of the Blessed Virgin, St. Gregory the Great, and St. Drausius, who was credited with the power of bestowing invincible might on his devotees, Thomas had gone to the great Abbey of Vézelay near Avallon, on Whitsun eve, June 1166. On the morrow, after celebrating mass and preaching to a great crowd of pilgrims in the abbey church, he solemnly cursed the obnoxious customs and all who adhered to them. He further excommunicated seven persons as being special enemies of the Church, including the great justiciar, Richard de Lucy, and other personal friends and councillors of the king. Henry himself would have been included in the list, but hearing

Becket at Pontigny.

that he was seriously ill the archbishop contented himself with a solemn call to repentance, and a threat of instant excommunication if it was not obeyed.

His legatine commission.

Henry in alarm despatched a message from Normandy to Richard de Lucy, directing him to summon a meeting of the bishops and clergy, and compel them to appeal to the pope against the primate. Under the guidance of Bishop Gilbert Foliot, an appeal was drawn up and sent to the pope in the name of all the English bishops and clergy. Thomas retorted with a crushing blow. He obtained a legatine commission for himself from the pope. The brief containing it was put into the hands of Bishop Gilbert as he was celebrating mass in his cathedral on St. Paul's day January 25, 1167. It required the absolute submission of the bishops to their primate, and the restitution of all Church property confiscated by the king and committed to their custody. Henry, however, paid no heed to the papal mandate. He was in a thoroughly vindictive mood, and had threatened the Cistercians, at their general chapter, that, if they continued to shelter Thomas at Pontigny, he would expel their Order from his dominions. On hearing this, the archbishop quitted Pontigny and became the guest of King Louis at Sens, where he was lodged in the Abbey of St. Columba.

Meeting at Montmirail, 1169.

A gleam of hope shone upon the strife in January 1169, when the two kings made a treaty at Montmirail. Thomas, who was still the guest of Louis, attended the meeting and suddenly prostrated himself before Henry, offering submission; but just as all present were rejoicing at the conclusion, as they hoped, of the quarrel, the archbishop repeated the obnoxious words, "saving God's honour and my order." Henry was enraged and the assembly was dissolved. Three months afterwards the archbishop, being at Clairvaux on Palm Sunday, launched another set of excommunications, including the name of Gilbert Foliot. A special messenger to England, eluding the guards that were posted at all the sea-ports, got into St. Paul's on Ascension Day, and thrust the letter containing the excommunication of the bishop into the hands of the celebrant during high mass. Foliot now threatened to revive an ancient right, as he

asserted, of metropolitical dignity for his see. Envoys came from the pope to try and settle the question, but as usual effected nothing.

Henry at last determined to employ a weapon which he had obtained from the pope three years before when he was in the extremity of distress, being blockaded in Rome by the forces of the emperor. This was a brief authorising the Archbishop of York to crown Henry the king's son, which was a direct infringement of the rights of Canterbury. Thomas, hearing of the king's intention, proclaimed an interdict and the pope confirmed it, and both pope and primate forbade the English bishops to take part in the act as unlawful. But their efforts were in vain; the ports were so strictly watched by the king's officials that no messenger could get through. At last the pope's letter was conveyed by a nun, and presented to the Archbishop of York at Westminster on June 13, 1170. It was too late. All the arrangements for the coronation had been made, and on the following day the ceremony was performed by Archbishop Roger; Gilbert Foliot and other prelates approving. This proceeding irritated every one. The King of France was enraged because his daughter was not crowned with her husband, while Thomas angrily demanded strong measures from the pope and cardinals. The demand could not be refused, and a sentence of suspension was pronounced upon all the prelates concerned in this supreme insult to the see of Canterbury.

Coronation of Henry's son, 1170.

Henry saw that he had gone too far. On July 22 he made peace with Louis and Becket in a personal interview near Fréteval. It was arranged that the archbishop's estates should be restored and that he should return to England; for the king was wise enough to see that Thomas in exile was a more dangerous opponent than Thomas in England. Difficulties, however, arose about the restitution of the property, and reconciliation with the excommunicated bishops; and when at last Becket embarked at Wissant on December 1, it was in the face of warnings of danger from the King of France and even from the pilot of the vessel which conveyed him. He landed at Sandwich, and on the way to Canterbury was greeted by

Return of Becket to England.

an enthusiastic crowd. The cathedral was decorated, and joyful music welcomed his return. He preached a pathetic sermon in the chapter-house on the text, "Here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come." In truth his mind was filled with forebodings of evil. His official conductor to England had been John of Oxford, Dean of Salisbury, one of his principal opponents, and at Canterbury some officials of the king demanded in his name the absolution of the suspended and excommunicated bishops. This Thomas refused to grant unless they solemnly abjured their errors. Bishops Gilbert of London and Jocelyn of Salisbury would have consented to do this, but Archbishop Roger would not yield, and finally the three bishops crossed to Normandy, where they found the king keeping Christmas at his hunting-seat of Bures near Bayeux. They displayed letters from the pope which had preceded the arrival of Becket, suspending all the bishops who had assisted in the coronation of the young Henry, and renewing the excommunication of the three of them. They invoked the protection of the king, and one of them unhappily observed that as long as Thomas lived, Henry would never enjoy peace and happiness in his kingdom. In a burst of irritation the king uttered the fatal words which were to destroy his peace and happiness for the rest of his life. "What miserable sluggards have I brought up in my kingdom that they should suffer their lord to be mocked by a low-born clerk."

The rash words fell on the ears of coarse-minded unscrupulous men, who interpreted them in a sense which the speaker had not intended to convey. Four knights, Reginald Fitz Urse, Hugh de Morville, William de Tracy, and Richard le Breton, forthwith took secret counsel together, and vowed that they would slay the archbishop. That night, Christmas-eve, they quitted the court by stealth, hurried to the coast, and crossed the Channel by different routes. Two of them landed near Dover, two at Winchelsea. They met at Saltwood in Kent, a castle belonging to the see of Canterbury, which Becket had vainly endeavoured to recover from Ralph de Broc, one of his bitterest adversaries, who was now occupying it. Here, in the dead of night, the scheme of action was finally concerted. Early the

Plot to murder him.

next morning, with a troop of soldiers hastily levied, they rode to Canterbury, about fifteen miles distant, and quartered themselves with Clarembald, Abbot of St. Augustine's, who had taken the king's side in his quarrel with Becket. Having issued an order in the king's name, forbidding the mayor and citizens of Canterbury to render assistance to the primate, they repaired in the afternoon to his palace. Dinner, which was held in the great hall at three, had just ended, the concluding hymn had been sung, the archbishop had retired to his private chamber. The knights, who had concealed their coats of mail with cloaks, joined the throng of poor folk who were lingering in the outer hall to receive their daily dole of food. Meeting the seneschal, William Fitz-Nigel, they desired to be conducted to the archbishop's chamber, where they were readily admitted, and found him sitting on his bed conversing with his friends, amongst whom were John, the learned Archdeacon of Salisbury, his chaplain William Fitz-Stephen, and Edward Grim, a monk.

After a prolonged and angry altercation with the archbishop the knights quitted the room, and hastening through the hall summoned their men, closed the gates of the palace yard, threw off their cloaks under a tree in the garden and girt on their swords. Then, returning to the hall, they attacked and wounded some of the servants who opposed their entrance, and made for the archbishop's chamber; but they found it fast barred. His terrified friends had urged him to take refuge in the cathedral. For some time he refused, reproaching them with cowardice, and even when they had got him through a back door into the cloisters, he halted until his cross was fetched to be borne before him. Then, half-pushed, half-dragged, he was taken along the north and east walks of the cloister to a door in the west wall of the north transept.[1] The darkness of the winter day was settling down: the cathedral was dimly lighted for vespers, which were being sung. The archbishop declared that he would not enter the church until the service was ended. Presently a cry arose—"armed men in the cloister!" and their tramp was heard as

The murderers at Canterbury.

[1] The cloisters at Canterbury, contrary to the usual arrangement, are on the *north* side of the church.

they advanced along the south walk, shouting as they came, "King's men, King's men!" Becket was dragged into the church. Some of the monks began to bar the door, but he forbade them, declaring that he would not have the house of God turned into a castle. Two means of escape were at hand. One flight of steps led from the transept into the crypt, another up to the roof: but Becket refused to take advantage of either. All his attendants now fled to various hiding-places in the church, except his old tutor Robert of Merton, his chaplain William Fitz-Stephen, and the faithful monk, Edward Grim. His intention seems to have been to die at his post before the high altar, and with this view he began to ascend the staircase leading from the transept to the north aisle of the choir.

It was too late. The knights were already in the transept. In the deepening gloom they could but dimly see the little group of figures on the stairs. "Stay!" cried one of the knights, "where is Thomas Becket, traitor to the king?" No answer was returned to the insulting question. "Where is the archbishop?" shouted Fitz Urse. "Here am I, Reginald," replied Thomas, "no traitor but archbishop and priest of God. What do you want?" and so saying he came down into the transept and took his stand between the chapel of St. Benedict, which opened out of the transept on its eastern side, and a pillar which at that time stood near the centre of the transept. The knights demanded the absolution of the excommunicated bishops: but it was refused. They then tried to drag him from the church, but setting his back against the pillar and putting forth his great strength, aided by the monk Grim, he repulsed their efforts, and flung one of them, Walter de Tracy, to the ground. Reginald Fitz Urse then struck the first blow, but in the darkness and confusion of the scuffle, only dashed the primate's cap from his head. The next blow was struck by Walter de Tracy. Edward Grim, who had kept his arms round Becket, threw one of them up to intercept the blow, and it fell broken or wounded to his side, while the assassin's sword grazed the primate's head and wounded his left shoulder. "Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit," said the archbishop, and per-

The martyrdom, December 29, 1170.

ceiving further resistance to be useless he covered his eyes with clasped hands, bowed his neck and said, "I commend my cause and the cause of the Church to God, to St. Denys of France, to St. Alphege, and to all saints." As Tracy dealt the third blow, Thomas fell first on his knees and then flat on his face. Grim heard him murmur, "For the name of Jesus Christ, and for the defence of His Church, I am willing to die." Richard le Breton then dealt him such a blow on the head that he severed the scalp from the skull and shattered his own sword on the pavement. Finally a renegade clerk, Hugh of Hornsea, who had joined the murderers as they entered the church, thrust his sword into the wound, and scattering the brains over the floor, cried—"Let us go, let us go, the traitor is dead: he will rise up no more."

The murderers rushed out of the church, down the cloisters, shouting as before, "King's men, King's men!" until they reached the palace, which they plundered of charters, papal briefs, ornaments, books, and other goods, including even horses, to the value of 2000 marks, and then they went their way.

The monks having come out of their hiding-places in the cathedral, bound up the ghastly wound in the archbishop's head, collected the blood and brains from the pavement, and then carried the body into the choir, where they laid it before the high altar. The next morning, hearing that Ralph de Broc threatened to carry off the corpse and fling it into a pit or pond, they kept the doors fast closed, and buried it in the crypt. In removing the archbishop's garments they gazed with wonder and joy on the coarse hair-cloth, swarming with vermin, which he wore next his skin, and the marks of his daily self-inflicted scourgings. "Lo," they cried, "what a true monk! what a true martyr! who suffered torture not only in his death but also in his life. What a true monk he was, and we knew it not!" And so amid their tears of sorrow for the loss of such a head they "laughed for joy" at having found so great a saint. Having arrayed the corpse in pontifical robes they laid it in a new marble sarcophagus behind the shrine of the Blessed Virgin, between the altars of St. Augustine and St. John the Baptist; placed the remains of the blood and brains in a vessel outside the tomb, and kept the doors of the crypt fast closed.

Burial of the body.

The church, having been desecrated by bloodshed, remained desolate for a year; the crucifixes were veiled; the altars and walls were stripped of their ornaments; the services were held without music in the chapter-house. At length, on the festival of St. Thomas, Apostle and Martyr, December 21, 1171, a ceremony of "reconciliation" was performed, in the presence of papal legates, by the Bishops of Chester and Exeter. The latter celebrated mass and preached on the text, "In the multitude of the sorrows that I had in my heart thy comforts have refreshed my soul." All Christendom was convulsed with horror and indignation at the foul and brutal murder of the archbishop, and he rapidly became an object of extraordinary veneration.

The Church "reconciled."

Within three years of his death the reports of miracles wrought by contact with his relics, by visits to his tomb, or direct invocation of his aid, procured his canonization. December 29 was fixed for his festival, and for three hundred and fifty years he was, undoubtedly, the most popular saint in England, and one of the most renowned in Europe. In England alone no less than sixty-nine churches were dedicated to him, the quantity of offerings heaped upon his shrine was prodigious, the stream of pilgrims incessant and multitudinous.

St. Thomas of Canterbury.

The king was at Argentan when he received the news of the murder. For three days he shut himself up, fasting and lying in sackcloth and ashes; uttering frequent and passionate lamentations, and calling God to witness that he was in no wise guilty of the primate's death. For five weeks he remained in seclusion, transacting no public business. In terror of excommunication, and of an interdict on his kingdom, he despatched envoys to the pope to avert the calamities by timely submission. In August he crossed to England and completed his conquest of Ireland. In the following spring, 1172, he had an interview with the aged Bishop of Winchester, Henry of Blois, and after visiting his recent conquest in Ireland, returned to Normandy, when he met legates from the pope at his castle of Gorran, and exchanged the kiss of peace with them on Tuesday, May 16, 1172. On the following Friday a council of bishops and

The king's grief.

nobles was held, the legates presiding, in the Cathedral of Avranches. On Sunday the 21st, being Rogation Sunday, Henry solemnly swore on the Gospels that he had neither ordered nor desired the death of the archbishop, but that as he feared his hasty speech had instigated the murderers, he would offer all possible satisfaction. He further promised on oath to be faithful to the pope, to restore the property of the see of Canterbury, to renounce the Constitutions of Clarendon, to go, if required by the pope, on a three years' crusade to Jerusalem or Spain, and to support 200 soldiers for the knights-templars.

Meanwhile storms began to gather fast and thick around him. His administrative reforms had aimed at strengthening the authority of the crown by placing a number of checks on the feudal power of the nobles. The coronation of his son Henry was intended to be one of these checks, but as it became one of the events which led up to the murder of Thomas, it turned to the king's disadvantage. The partition of his dominions amongst his sons led to jealousies and quarrels. Henry, the eldest, utterly unfilial and unprincipled, became in 1173 the head of a league of his father's enemies,—Louis of France, Philip of Flanders, William the Lion, King of Scotland, and the Count of Champagne, together with some of the English barons who resented the curtailment of their powers. Normandy and the eastern counties of England were invaded by the Flemings. Brittany and Poitou revolted, the King of Scotland marched across the border and was joined by some of the discontented barons. Henry, with astonishing energy and skill, beat his enemies on the continent one after another, and by July 1174 he crossed to England, where the mass of the people had remained loyal, and the justiciar and other faithful adherents had gained some successes over the rebels.

His difficulties.

Henry's first act after his return was to make a pilgrimage to the tomb of the murdered archbishop. On his journey from Southampton to Canterbury his only food was bread and water. Outside the west gate of the city, before St. Dunstan's Church, he put on the woollen gown of a pilgrim and walked barefoot to the cathedral, staining with his blood the rough stones with which the street was paved.

His penance.

After a prayer in the porch he was conducted to the scene of the murder, where he knelt and kissed the sacred stone on which the primate had fallen. Thence, accompanied by a crowd of bishops and monks, he descended to the crypt, where he flung himself upon the martyr's grave. Bishop Gilbert Foliot having solemnly declared on behalf of the king that he had never sought the archbishop's death, and that he craved pardon for the rash speech which had led to it, the assembled prelates granted the desired absolution. Then kneeling before the tomb and bending his head over it with shoulders bared, the king received five strokes with a rod from each of the bishops and abbots present, and three from each of the eighty monks. He spent the whole night fasting in the crypt; at dawn he visited in turn the several altars and shrines in the upper church, made costly offerings, heard mass, drank of the martyr's well, and then rode off to London, carrying with him one of the phials containing the martyr's blood mixed with water, which were usually given to pilgrims. A few days after his arrival in London he was roused from sleep in the dead of night by a messenger from the North, who brought the joyful tidings that the King of Scotland was a prisoner in Richmond Castle. The capture had been effected on the very day that Henry had left Canterbury after doing penance at Becket's tomb and, as the rebellion in England collapsed after this event, the crowning mercy was naturally attributed to the pacification of the holy martyr.

Henry's religious foundations.

The promise of Henry to go on a three years' crusade, if required by the pope, as part of his expiation for the death of Becket, was commuted for a vow to found three religious houses. This vow appears to have been fulfilled by the establishment of Newstead in Sherwood Forest for Austin canons, of Vaubourg for Knights Templars, or de Liget in the forest of Loches for Carthusians, and of Witham, in the forest of Selwood, Somerset, for the same Order. About the same time also the college of secular priests which Harold had founded at Waltham was dissolved and refounded for canons-regular; and the nuns of Amesbury in Wiltshire were expelled for unchastity of life, and their places were filled with nuns from the Abbey of Fontevrault, on which the English house was bestowed.

Of these foundations the only one of much importance was that of Witham, and this mainly by reason of its connection with St. Hugh of Avalon. The demesne of Witham was granted to the Carthusian Order, free of all rents or charges payable to the crown, and all interference from royal foresters. In the deed of gift Henry declares that he builds on this demesne a house in honour of the Blessed Virgin, St. John Baptist, and all Saints, for the good of his soul and the souls of his predecessors and successors. The first body of monks was sent over at his request from the Grande Chartreuse in 1178. But the new settlers found themselves beset with difficulties. No provision had been made for the poor people who were occupying the site of the proposed house, and they naturally resented the intrusion of the monks. The first prior resigned, the second died, and the brethren lived in a miserable condition in wooden huts guarded by a palisade.

Carthusian house at Witham.

In this extremity the king was advised to try and secure Hugh of Avalon for his prior, commended to him as a man of noble birth, of extraordinary holiness, and practical wisdom. Hugh was at that time procurator of the Grande Chartreuse. Being warned that it might be difficult to persuade Hugh to quit the house, or the monks to part with him, Henry sent envoys headed by Reginald Fitz-Jocelyn, Bishop of Bath and Wells, with letters soliciting permission to make Hugh prior of the house at Witham. The envoys found the prior and the whole brotherhood most reluctant to yield consent, while Hugh himself vehemently opposed the proposal. He had not been able, he said, to govern his own soul rightly, even with the help of all the examples and teaching in that holy place: how then could he go into a strange land to govern the souls of others? The king had made a mistake, and must look out for a better man. But the envoys persisted, and at last by common consent the decision was placed in the hands of the Bishop of Grenoble who, after due consideration, gave his judgment that the time had come when Hugh must follow the example of his divine Master by making a sacrifice for the good of others. So Hugh tore himself away from the sorrowful embraces of the brethren and accompanied the envoys to

Hugh of Avalon made prior.

England, being presented on the way through Normandy to the king, who received him most graciously, and sent him under honourable conduct to Witham. The few and suffering monks who were there welcomed his coming as of an angel of God.

There was indeed much, or rather everything to be done, and in dealing with Henry great prudence and tact, together with courage and resolution, were needful. Hugh, however, combined much of the shrewdness and wit of Lanfranc with the holiness of Anselm. By his firm and skilful diplomacy the king was persuaded to make provision for the needs of the existing tenants, and for the erection of the monastic buildings. When the latter, however, were near completion the work was stopped for want of funds. The king was preoccupied and harassed by the rebellion of his sons: two deputations from the monks were dismissed with only fair promises. The brethren grew impatient, and at last at their request Hugh himself set forth to seek an interview with the king. Henry was gracious and promised much, but he gave nothing, and did not even assign a time when anything would be given. An impetuous brother, Gerard of Nevers, who accompanied Hugh, lost his patience and his temper. Let the king give up the work or go on with it as he listed; for his own part he and his brethren would return to the desert of the Chartreuse. It was better to go back to their rocks in the Alps than wrangle with a man who deemed all money expended on the salvation of his soul mere waste. Let him keep his cherished riches until he had to leave them to some ungrateful heir. Hugh, in an agony of shame, was trying in vain to stop the mouth of his hot-headed companion. The king, strange to say, did not fly into one of his frenzies of rage, but having calmly listened to Master Gerard's violent taunts, and observing the distress of Prior Hugh, he turned to him and said: "And pray, good sir, what are you meditating? do you also intend to quit our kingdom?" "No, sire," replied Hugh, "I do not thus despair of you. I pity these many hindrances and distractions which prevent you from consulting the interest of your soul. When the Lord relieves you from these cares you will doubtless complete the

Hugh's meeting with the king.

good work which you have begun." The gentleness, sympathy, and forbearance of Hugh succeeded where bluster and anger failed. The king embraced him, and declared with an oath, "As I hope for salvation thou shalt not leave my kingdom as long as I live. With thee will I share my counsels, with thee will I consult about the interest of my soul." Forthwith he gave the sum of money required, and ordered the work to be completed with all speed.

The see of Canterbury remained vacant after the murder of Becket for more than two years. In the summer of 1172 the young King Henry was directed by his father to take steps for the election of a new primate. Odo, the Prior of Christchurch, was summoned to Windsor on September 1 with a deputation from the chapter. They demanded for themselves a free election. The question was referred to the king in Normandy, where Odo visited him. Henry was very gracious, but urged the election of the Bishop of Bayeux, described by the Chroniclers as a pliant man, whom the king could have turned in any direction. An assembly of bishops and clergy in London refused to accept him. At another synod held in March 1173 Roger, Abbot of Bec, was elected, but he refused to accept the office, and finally the bishops, the monks, and the king agreed in electing Richard, Prior of Dover. He was a Norman, who had been educated in the monastery of Christchurch, Canterbury, and had become one of Archbishop Theobald's chaplains. He took the oath of fealty to the king, "saving his order," and no promise to observe "the customs" was exacted from him. The young Henry and his partisans opposed his consecration because their consent had not been obtained to the election. Both sides appealed to Rome. Pope Alexander III. confirmed the election, and not only consecrated Richard at Anagni on April 7, 1174, but bestowed the legatine office upon him, and gave him a letter confirming the primacy of his see.

Richard, Abp. of Canterbury, 1174.

Archbishop Richard was not a man of commanding intellect, but he had good sense and good temper, and when the occasion required it he could enforce his authority with determination and courage. He held the balance so evenly between the extreme

His vigorous administration.

partisans of the king, and of the principles upheld by Becket, that he was not cordially liked by either side. In a letter to the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, and Norwich he expressed his strong dissatisfaction with the law by which the murderer of a layman was hung, while the murderer of a clerk only suffered excommunication, after which he could go to Rome, and obtain absolution. In fact the slaughter of a sheep or a goat was visited with a more severe punishment than the murder of a priest. The escape of the murderers of St. Thomas was, of course, a glaring instance of this inequality. In his judgment the punishment of such crimes should be left to the king, the Church granting absolution to the culprit, if contrite, *in articulo mortis*. He strenuously opposed the attempts of monastic houses to claim exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. In a letter to Pope Alexander he denounces such independence as one of the most mischievous abuses of the time. The want of supervision by an outside authority led to much squandering of the monastic property, and was injurious to the principle of discipline and subordination throughout the hierarchy; if abbots defied bishops, so in time might deans and archdeacons, and the authority even of metropolitans would be disputed by their suffragans. In the visitation of his province Archbishop Richard did not spare the monasteries. In twelve houses where the office of abbot was vacant he issued peremptory orders to the chapter to fill it up without delay. He deposed the Abbot of Peterborough for immoral conduct, he compelled the Abbot of Malmesbury to make profession of obedience to the Bishop of Salisbury, and he exacted it himself from the abbot-elect of St. Augustine's, Canterbury. The monks there claimed exemption on the strength of charters, which the archbishop proved to be forgeries.

Nor was he less resolute in maintaining the precedence of his see over York. Roger, Archbishop of York, refused to attend a synod held at Westminster in 1175, and some of his clergy who came to it asserted his right to have his cross carried before him in the province of Canterbury, and also to exercise jurisdiction over the sees of Lincoln, Worcester, and Hereford. These claims not being allowed, an appeal was made to Rome, and at the request of

A strife for precedency.

the king, a legate, Cardinal Hugh, was sent to settle the controversy. For this purpose a synod was convened in March 1176 in St. Catharine's chapel in the infirmary of Westminster Abbey. The legate was not prepared for the violent scene which ensued. The Archbishop of York came early, intending to secure the seat on the legate's right, but he found it already occupied by the Archbishop of Canterbury; he attempted to squeeze himself in between his brother metropolitan and the legate, but as no room was made for him he sat him down on Canterbury's knee. Enraged at this insult, the Canterbury officials seized him, threw him down, tore his robes, kicked and cudgelled him, and finally dragged him out of the chapel. The Archbishop of Canterbury interceded to save him from further violence, the legate sought safety in flight, and the assembly broke up in confusion. In the following August a synod was held at Winchester, when a truce was made between the archbishops for five years. Meanwhile their rival claims were to be investigated by the Archbishop of Rouen and the French bishops, whose judgment was to be accepted as final.

The only person who profited by the visit of Cardinal Hugh was the king, who obtained his consent (by means of a bribe, it was said) that clerks should be tried in the secular court for transgression of the forest laws, and that murderers of clerks, who confessed or were convicted, should be finally tried in the secular court, the bishop being present. Cardinal Hugh had been invited by the king, but another Cardinal, Vivian, whom the pope sent unbidden as legate *a latere* to visit Scotland, Ireland, and Norway, had a very ungracious reception in England. The king sent two bishops to demand by what authority he had dared to enter his kingdom without his license, and he was not permitted to pass on to Scotland until he had taken an oath that he would do nothing on his legation contrary to the king's will and pleasure.

Two papal legates.

The only other event of importance during the episcopate of Archbishop Richard was a synod held at Westminster under his presidency in the summer of 1175. At this synod, which was the first that had been held in England since 1129, several canons were enacted based for the most part on the decretals: but as these

Synod of Westminster, 1175.

concern the internal condition of the Church they will be dealt with in another chapter. Archbishop Richard died on February 16, 1184. He was succeeded by Baldwin, Bishop of Worcester, a man distinguished alike for learning, holiness, and uprightness of character. His election was preceded by a long strife between the king, the bishops, and the monks of Christchurch; but the details of this and also of the archbishop's prolonged contest with the monks must also be reserved for another chapter.

Baldwin, Abp. of Canterbury, 1184.

In the latter years of his life Henry showed real consideration for the best interests of the Church, and one of his wisest and most praiseworthy acts was the appointment in 1186 of the saintly Prior of Witham to the see of Lincoln. That great diocese had been without a bishop for the greater part of nineteen years. Robert Chesney had died in 1167. The king had been sternly rebuked by Thomas Becket because he took no steps to fill the vacant see. In 1173, two years after the murder of Becket, Henry nominated his illegitimate son Geoffrey, who was only in deacon's orders. The nomination, however, was confirmed by the pope in 1175, and for five years Geoffrey received the revenues of the see and administered the temporal affairs. And this he appears to have done well, for although William of Newburgh says that he was "more skilful in fleecing the flock than in feeding it," he was certainly diligent in recovering alienated estates; he redeemed some of the ornaments of the cathedral which his predecessors had pawned to the celebrated Jew, Aaron of Lincoln: he added some gifts of his own, including two large bells, and he filled the prebendal stalls with men of ability and learning. But as he did not seek ordination to the priesthood, episcopal consecration was impossible, and the diocese remained without a spiritual head.

The see of Lincoln long vacant.

In 1181 the pope insisted that Geoffrey should either be ordained or resign. Walter of Coutances was elected and consecrated in 1183, but two years afterwards he was translated to the Archbishopric of Rouen; and the see again remained vacant for more than a year. It was not till May 1186, when the king held a council of bishops and nobles at Eynsham, that a proposal was made to fill up the vacancy.

The canons of Lincoln were summoned and, in accordance with the Constitutions of Clarendon, were required to hold an election in the king's chapel. There were several candidates amongst the canons themselves, and much division of opinion. The name of the holy Prior of Witham was then submitted to them by the king. After some objections raised on the score of his being a foreigner, ignorant of the language and customs of the country, and a recluse ill fitted for the administration of a large diocese, he was unanimously elected with the hearty approbation of Archbishop Baldwin and the other prelates and nobles. When the tidings were brought to Hugh he refused to accept the office because the election had not been fully made in the chapter-house of the cathedral. The canons returned to Lincoln and there again unanimously elected Hugh, but he now pleaded unfitness, and declared that nothing short of a command from the general of his Order would induce him to accept the burden. An influential deputation of canons was therefore sent to the Grande Chartreuse, and had little difficulty in obtaining the required command, to which Hugh yielded, although with extreme reluctance. No one, he used to say, could imagine the agony of his soul at the prospect of quitting the seclusion and tranquillity of the cloister for the busy public life of a bishop. On his departure from Witham he was conducted by a large escort of persons, clerical and lay, but he himself, although mounted on a horse richly caparisoned, was attired in the garb of a simple monk, and on his saddle bow was strapped the sheep-skin rug in which he wrapped himself at night. As the cavalcade approached Winchester it was met by a crowd of citizens and members of the royal household. He was consecrated at Westminster on St. Matthew's day (September 24) by Archbishop Baldwin, to whom he made profession of obedience.

Hugh of Witham elected, 1186.

On arriving at Lincoln he lodged in St. Catharine's priory outside the walls, where he spent most of the night hours in devotion. Early the next day, attended by a multitude of the citizens, he walked barefoot to the minster, where he was duly enthroned by the Archdeacon of Canterbury. The archdeacon demanded his customary fees, to which Hugh replied that he would give as

Hugh's enthronement.

much for his throne as he had given for his mitre—which was nothing. And as Hugh had not ridden into the city the archdeacon lost one of his usual perquisites—the horse on which the bishop made his formal entry. The steward of his household, who had been engaged for him by the king, asked how many deer out of his park should be slain for the feast with which his enthronement was celebrated. "You may take three hundred," was the reply, "and more if you think necessary." The answer was reported by the astonished steward to the king and his court, who were extremely amazed at the simplicity of the good man, and "Bishop Hugh's deer" became a proverbial expression.

His fearless administration.

In the discharge of his duty, and in defence of justice, righteousness, and good discipline, Hugh did not shrink from facing the wrath of such a strong-willed and hot-tempered sovereign as Henry II. The severity of the forest laws and the insolent tyranny of the royal foresters were amongst the most grievous oppressions to which the people were subjected. Some of Bishop Hugh's tenants had been insulted by the foresters, whereupon he promptly excommunicated the chief forester. This bold act was a violation of one of the Constitutions of Clarendon, which the king expected to be observed in practice, although he had formally retracted them. When it was reported to him he fell into one of his paroxysms of rage; but he did not take any active proceedings in the matter. Meanwhile a prebendal stall at Lincoln fell vacant by the death of the occupant. The courtiers advised the king to ask the bishop to confer it on one of themselves. They fancied that Hugh would gladly accede to the request as a means of reinstating himself in the king's favour. But they were much mistaken. The king was at Woodstock, the bishop at Dorchester, near Oxford—the extremity of his diocese. Here he received the king's letter asking for the prebend. The answer—a verbal one sent by the bearers of the letter—was plain and decisive. "Tell the king that ecclesiastical benefices must be bestowed on ecclesiastics; the occupants should serve the altar, not the palace, the treasury, or the exchequer. The king has plenty of secular honours wherewith to reward secular services."

Some of Hugh's enemies at court represented his speech as

a sign of base ingratitude if not of positive disloyalty; the bishop was summoned to meet the king at Woodstock and answer for his conduct. He found the king seated in a wood, with his courtiers sitting round about him. Hugh was received in silence; none rose or saluted him. Nothing daunted, he tapped the courtier who was sitting next the king on the shoulder to make room for him, and sat him down beside the king. Not a word was spoken. Presently the king asked for a needle, and began to sew a bit of rag round one of his fingers, which he had cut. After watching this operation for a while in silence, the bishop quietly remarked, "How like you are to your relations at Falaise." This bold allusion to his ancestress the tanner's daughter—the mother of William the Conqueror, and to glove-making, the staple trade of her native town, tickled the king's fancy, and the awkward silence was broken by his laughter, which presently became general. Henry then asked Hugh to explain his recent conduct. He replied that as he owed his bishopric to the exertions of the king he would be imperilling the soul of his royal master if he did not fulfil the duties of his office. That was why he had restrained an oppressor of the Church by an ecclesiastical penalty; that was why he had refused to have his hand forced in filling up the vacant prebend; and he felt sure that the king would ratify his action. It was an irresistible appeal to Henry's better nature, his conscience, and good sense. He embraced Hugh and commended himself to his prayers. Nothing more was said about the vacant prebend; the peccant forester received a flogging, expressed contrition, and became one of Hugh's most devoted friends.

A scene with the king.

There was indeed in the sweetness, and simplicity, and fearless uprightness of Hugh a charm which softened the most rugged natures and won for him universal affection and respect. Even the lower animals were attracted to him. There is nothing more beautiful and affecting in the lives of many of the saints than the stories of their friendly relations with the lower animals. Allowing for exaggerations and marvels, there must be a large residuum of truth in these tales. The gentleness of animals to children, and their ready attachment to persons

Charm of Hugh's character.

who in simplicity and innocency of life resemble little children, illustrate the truth that discord and strife were brought into the world by sin, and that harmony can only be restored by pure goodness and love. The truth of the matter was well expressed by the English hermit, St. Guthlac, in the eighth century, in his reply to some visitors who were astonished to see the swallows twittering round him and perching upon his head and shoulders. "Know you not," he said, "that he who is united to God by purity of heart finds all these sinless creatures united to himself. The birds of heaven, like the angels of God, may safely associate with those who have fled into the desert from the wickedness of the world." As St. Benedict at Subiaco shared his frugal meal with a raven, as St. Cuthbert and St. Francis of Assisi gathered birds and beasts around them as friendly companions, so the cell of Hugh at Witham had been frequented by a bernacle-goose which fed from his hand. At the bishop's manor of Stow, near Lincoln, there appeared about the time of Hugh's enthronement a wild swan of extraordinary size. It displayed great ferocity, attacking and killing many of the other swans; but on the arrival of the bishop, having been caught and presented to him, it fed fearlessly from his hand and became his inseparable companion whenever he was at Stow—greeting him on his arrival with cries of joy, fondly burying its long neck in the folds of his dress, and fiercely attacking any one who ventured to approach when he was asleep. During the absences of the bishop the bird retired to the lake, but on his return, even when he had been away so long as two years, it manifested extraordinary joy, hastening to him as soon as it heard his voice with loud cries and flapping wings. Sculptors and painters, therefore, did right to represent St. Hugh with the faithful swan by his side. It was regarded as an emblem and an evidence of the purity of his life. The feeling is prettily expressed by the thirteenth-century author of the "metrical life" of the saint:—

Hugh's swan.

> Haec avis in vita candens, in funere cantans,
> Sancti pontificis vitam, mortemque figurat;
> Candens dum vivit, notat hunc vixisse pudicum;
> Cantans dum moritur, notat hunc decedere tutum.

This bird in life so white, in death so sweet,
Is of the holy Hugh an emblem meet;
Whiteness in life denotes his living pure,
Sweet song in death, his heavenly peace secure.

AUTHORITIES.—The same as for last chapter, with the addition of the *Gesta Henr. II.* vol. i., ed. Stubbs, and Roger of Howden, *Chron.* vol. ii., ed. Stubbs (both in Rolls series). For all that relates to the murder of Becket, in addition to the original authorities, see Dean Stanley's *Memorials of Canterbury Cathedral.* For the life of St. Hugh, the *Magna Vita,* ed. Dimock (Rolls series); and the *Metrical Life.* Of modern lives the best, allowing for some prejudices of the Roman Catholic writer, is *The Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln,* by Herbert Thurston, S.J.

CHAPTER XI

WEAK KINGS AND STRONG PRELATES

Richard I., 1189–1199. John, 1199–1216. Abps. of Canterbury: Baldwin, 1185–1190. Hubert Walter, 1193–1205. Stephen Langton, 1207–1228

THE great King Henry II. died at Chinon, July 6, 1189, worn out by the harassing labours of his long and troubled reign, which culminated in the distressing rebellion of his sons.

On September 3 his eldest surviving son Richard was crowned in Westminster Abbey by Archbishop Baldwin with great pomp, and as the people gazed upon his handsome countenance and his tall commanding figure, they might well have hoped that they beheld in him a king who would be not unworthy of his father or the greatest of his predecessors. But it was soon apparent that the heart of Richard was absorbed in the Crusade to which he had dedicated himself before his father's death, and that his immediate object was to raise as much money for it as he could from his new kingdom. In the course of a nominal reign of ten years, he spent barely six months in England. The administration was in the hands of ministers, who discharged their duties on the whole with ability and integrity, although many of them had bought their offices. They were for the most part ecclesiastics. Some of the principal appointments were made at a council held at Pipewell in Northamptonshire immediately after Richard's coronation. Hugh de Puiset, the high-born, magnificent, energetic, ambitious Bishop of Durham, was made one of two chief justiciars, who had five subordinate

Coronation of Richard I. 1189.

Ecclesiastical appointments.

justiciars under them. For this office he paid 1000 marks, and 2000 more for the sheriffdom of Northumberland. The see of London, vacant by the death of Gilbert Foliot, was given to Richard Fitz-Nigel, the treasurer and historian of the exchequer, the son of the Nigel, Bishop of Ely, who had been treasurer in the days of Henry I. William of Longchamp, Bishop-elect of Ely, was made chancellor, for which he had to pay 3000 marks. Reginald, Bishop of Bath, offered a thousand more, but Longchamp was a personal favourite with the king. Hubert Walter, a nephew of the late king's old servant, Ralph Glanville, was made Bishop of Salisbury, a man who combined in a remarkable degree the qualities of prelate, soldier, lawyer, and statesman. Godfrey, son of Richard de Lucy, the loyal justiciar of Henry II., was made Bishop of Winchester, and bought the sheriffdom of Hants, together with the castles of Winchester and Porchester, for 3000 marks. The sheriffdom of Leicestershire, Staffordshire, and Warwickshire were bought by Hugh of Nonant, Bishop of Lichfield.

Longchamp, Bp. of Ely, chancellor.

Of all these great men the one who rose for a time to the position of almost supreme ruler was William Longchamp, Bishop of Ely. He was a Norman of humble origin and mean appearance—plain, short, lame, if not actually deformed, but clear-headed, ambitious, strong-willed. He had been the chaplain and confidential agent of Richard before he became king. He was faithful to Richard, and relentless in exacting money to serve his interests; and as he did not understand English, and disliked the English people, he was very unpopular. He was regarded as an upstart by the older and more aristocratic statesmen, but he was probably not the monster of wickedness or of ugliness that he is represented by his enemies. He had no sooner entered on his office of chancellor than he began to exercise his authority with a high hand. He refused to admit Bishop Hugh de Puiset to the exchequer, and presently deprived him of his sheriff's jurisdiction over Northumberland. Godfrey de Lucy was deprived not only of his sheriffdom and castles, but even of his patrimony, and the Bishop of Lichfield also was forced to surrender his sheriffdom. Anticipating the complaints which would be

His harsh administration.

laid against him, he hastened over to the king in Normandy and obtained an extension of his powers. The Bishop of Durham's justiciarship was limited to the north of England. William Longchamp was made chief justiciar, and the custody of the Tower of London was committed to him. Armed with these high powers, he inflicted severe punishment on the inhabitants of York and the neighbourhood for a massacre of the Jews. Some of the principal offenders and sufferers at his hands were Percies, relatives of the Bishop of Durham. The bishop himself, who had gone to Normandy, was arrested on his return and deprived of all his castles and recently purchased honours: almost everything indeed except his bishopric. York Minster was placed under an interdict, and the canons were suspended because they did not receive Longchamp as a papal legate, although the commission had only been promised and was not yet received.

He held a synod at Gloucester on August 1, 1190, when he was reconciled to the Bishop of Winchester and restored him his patrimony, but not the castles; and on October 13 he presided as legate over a synod at Westminster, with the Bishop of London on his right hand and the Bishop of Winchester on his left. But no record has been preserved of the transactions at these councils. Longchamp's energies were almost exclusively devoted to secular affairs, and he stands out as a typical instance of a prelate whose ecclesiastical character was entirely obscured by his position as a great officer of State. As such he was mainly occupied in raising funds to meet the king's expenses on the Crusade. For this purpose he made frequent progresses through the kingdom, and the burden of entertaining him, with his vast retinue, numbering 1000 horsemen, in addition to the exactions which he levied, together with his haughty demeanour, filled up the measure of his unpopularity. At last his little day was over. The king's brother John placed himself at the head of a revolt. Longchamp was excommunicated by the bishops in 1191, besieged in the Tower of London, forced to surrender after a three days' blockade, and deprived of his castles and secular offices; his see was sequestrated, and he himself ordered to quit the realm. He visited King Richard in his captivity in 1193, and was per-

Fall of Longchamp.

mitted to return to organise the collection of money for the king's ransom, and on Richard's restoration and second coronation in Winchester Cathedral he walked in the procession as chancellor on the king's right hand. Meanwhile Archbishop Baldwin had died in Palestine.

The third Crusade had absorbed the interest of Christendom and attracted the noblest spirits of the day. The capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens, under the renowned Saladin, in 1187, had been followed by the fall of nearly all the Christian strongholds. The pope made a passionate appeal to all Christians to retrieve this disaster and disgrace. The Emperor Frederick I., King Henry of England, his son Richard, and Philip of France vowed to take the cross. At a council held at Le Mans it was decreed that throughout Henry's dominions a tithe of all revenues of goods of laymen and clergy should be devoted to the holy war. The pope promised absolution to all who confessed and repented of their sins before going on the Crusade, and added various other privileges, together with abundance of good advice. Archbishop Baldwin preached the Crusade with great fervour and success, especially in Wales. Meanwhile the Emperor Frederick had perished on the journey, and only the remnants of his host reached Acre, where they increased the plague and famine by which the besieging force was afflicted. Help was anxiously awaited from Richard of England and Philip of France. They started together, but halted during the winter of 1190-91 at Messina, where their mutual jealousy nearly led to open strife. Archbishop Baldwin and Hubert Walter, Bishop of Salisbury, with his uncle, Ralph Glanville, had pressed on to Acre. Plague and famine were making havoc of the crusading force. Moreover, the besiegers were themselves besieged by Saracen troops. Ralph Glanville died soon after his arrival. On November 12, 1190, the crusaders made an attack upon Saladin's camp. Baldwin blessed the host, and 200 knights with 300 attendants, who were maintained at his cost, took part in the assault, bearing on high the banner of St. Thomas the Martyr. The attempt was unsuccessful, and the crusaders' own camp would have been taken had not Baldwin himself, with Hubert Walter and other prelates defended it with valour and skill.

The third Crusade, 1190.

The crusaders were in truth thoroughly demoralised. With that strange recklessness which often characterises men in times of physical distress and danger, they abandoned themselves to drinking, gambling, and all manner of licentiousness.

Death of Abp. Baldwin.

The archbishop was grievously vexed by such unchristian living amongst the soldiers of the cross. It preyed upon his spirits; he fell ill, and on November 19 he died. Bishop Hubert Walter became the chief commander of the English force. He united the skill of a general with the piety of a priest. He framed a simple daily service for the army, calculated to stimulate their courage, and remind them of the sanctity of the cause; he ministered to the sick, and raised a subscription for the relief of the starving.

King Richard, having conquered Cyprus on the way, arrived before Acre on June 8, 1191, and early in July the town surrendered. On the march to Jerusalem an assault of the enemy on the French contingent would have been successful but for the prompt succour brought by the Bishop of Salisbury, and in the following year, when Richard was prostrated with illness, and the crusading host was on the point of dispersing or surrendering, the Bishop of Salisbury saved the situation by making a truce with Saladin for three years, three months, three weeks, and three days. He also arranged terms on which pilgrimages might be made with safety to the holy places. With this very partial success the Crusade came to an end. The army disbanded. Richard departed, and was taken prisoner on his way home by his enemy Leopold, Duke of Austria. Hubert Walter, having conducted the English host to Sicily, visited his captive king, and then, hastening to England, where he arrived in April 1193, he promptly suppressed an attempt of John to secure the crown, and exerted himself energetically to raise a ransom for the king.

Valour and skill of Bp. Hubert Walter.

The see of Canterbury had been vacant since the death of Baldwin. Soon after Hubert's return the queen-mother and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Lincoln, and Rochester received a letter from Richard, desiring them to secure the election of Hubert to the primacy. The chapter were quite willing to elect so dis-

He is elected Abp. of Canterbury.

tinguished a man, but they were determined to assert their independence; so when they appeared in obedience to the summons to confer with the bishops and magnates respecting the election they announced that they had already elected Hubert Walter. The bishops were displeased at being slighted, but could not do otherwise than assent. Hubert was enthroned, and received his pall on November 7, and by the end of the year Richard made him justiciar. He officiated at the second coronation of the king, which was celebrated at Winchester after he came back from captivity in March 1194, and after the king's departure in May, never to return, Hubert became vicegerent of the kingdom. In this position his devotion to secular affairs was reproved by the saintly Bishop of Lincoln. The heavy taxation which he was compelled to impose in order to meet Richard's incessant demands for money at last provoked an insurrection, which the archbishop suppressed with great severity, even going so far as to have the leader, William Fitz-Osbert, dragged from sanctuary to execution.

In November 1197 there came a demand from the king for 300 knights, or money sufficient to hire as many mercenaries, to serve against Philip of France. The archbishop convened a council of bishops and barons at Oxford, where the Bishop of London, speaking as dean of the province, declared his willingness to comply with the demand. Not so the holy Bishop of Lincoln. "I know," he said, "that the Church of Lincoln is bound to provide military service for our lord the king, but only in this country. Outside England no such service is due. I would rather return to my native solitudes in the Alps than suffer my church to be subjected to this novel burden." Herbert, Bishop of Salisbury, refused on the same grounds, and it must be presumed that other bishops, emboldened by their example, took the same course, for the archbishop dissolved the meeting in great wrath and reported its failure to the king. Richard was furiously angry, and ordered the property of the two leading offenders to be confiscated. The order was executed on the Bishop of Salisbury, who afterwards redeemed his possessions by a heavy fine; but none of the royal

Hugh of Lincoln refuses a royal demand.

officials dared to lay hands on the property of the revered Bishop of Lincoln. In August 1198 Hugh crossed to Normandy and met the king at Roche d'Andeli. Richard first stared angrily at him, then averted his face and refused the kiss of peace, but the undaunted Hugh seized the king's dress and shook it violently, saying, "The kiss is due to me, for I have come a long journey to see thee: yea, I have earned it." Like his father, the king was softened by the bishop's boldness and good-humoured persistency. He turned to him with a smile, and gave him the kiss. Presently he attended mass in the chapel of the castle, and when he received the pax from an archbishop whose duty it was to present it to him, he stepped forward and offered it to Hugh for him to kiss. The opposition of Hugh to the demands of the king may be compared to the resistance of Archbishop Thomas in 1163 to the new regulation made by Henry II. respecting the sheriffs' aid. The refusal of Hugh, however, appears to have been limited to the demand for men to serve outside the kingdom. He could not refuse to pay scutage, but claimed exemption for his church from all obligation to send knights beyond sea.

His meeting with the king.

It is characteristic of Bishop Hugh's courage and faithfulness to duty, that after his reconciliation with the king on this question, he was not deterred from reproving him for his unfaithfulness to his marriage vows. Richard received his admonitions on this and other matters, especially the sale of sacred offices, in good part, and said that if all bishops were like Hugh no sovereign in Christendom would presume to oppose them.

The accumulation of offices on Hubert Walter was unprecedented. He had been for a time primate, legate, chief justiciar, chancellor, and vicegerent of the realm. On the accession of Innocent III. to the papacy the monks of Canterbury submitted to him a list of grievances, one of the chief amongst them being that the primate was so immersed in secular affairs that he could not properly discharge his duties as archbishop. Innocent wrote a peremptory letter to the king, commanding him as he valued his salvation not to permit the archbishop or any other priest to hold a secular office. Hubert, accord-

Hubert Walter resigns justiciarship.

ingly, was compelled to resign the office of justiciar; and his place was filled by a layman, Geoffrey Fitz-Peter, who had been a sheriff of Northampton in the reign of Henry II. Hubert Walter was a very able and high-minded man, who strove to discharge conscientiously the multifarious duties that devolved upon him; but the custom of heaping manifold offices, sacred and secular, upon men who could not adequately discharge all of them, was only too common.

The evils of this practice were abundantly illustrated by the career of Geoffrey, the natural son of Henry II. Having been compelled, as we have seen,[1] to resign the see of Lincoln in 1181, Geoffrey had retained the office of archdeacon, to which his father added that of treasurer of York, and other offices secular and ecclesiastical, including finally one of the greatest—the chancellorship of England. In the rebellion of his sons, which embittered the end of Henry's reign, Geoffrey alone had remained faithful to him, and tended him in his dying hours with affectionate care. The last earthly wish expressed by the king was that Geoffrey should receive the archbishopric of York, which had been vacant since the death of Archbishop Roger in 1181. Richard I. respected his father's wish and nominated Geoffrey to the see. He was elected by a majority of the chapter, but the chief resident dignitaries—Hubert Walter, the dean, the precentor, and the archdeacon—were strong-willed men, and having enjoyed much independence during the vacancy of the see they did not welcome the appointment of an archbishop such as Geoffrey, of illegitimate birth and unclerical antecedents and habits.

Geoffrey, Abp. of York.

And if the chapter was jealous, Geoffrey was impetuous and tactless, and his circumstances were often very unfortunate and adverse. The result was implacable strife throughout the whole of his episcopate. Archbishop Baldwin, who was on the point of departure for the Crusade, forbade Geoffrey to be consecrated by any one but himself, an unwarrantable assumption on his part, and as the confirmation of the election could not be obtained from Rome before he started the prohibition meant indefinite delay. Geoffrey, meanwhile, was

His strife with his chapter.

[1] Above, p. 192.

ordained priest at Southwell by the Bishop of Withern, a suffragan of York, and sent to Rome for his pall. Soon afterwards he went to York. Here he found a new dean in the place of Hubert Walter, who had been made Bishop of Salisbury, and a new treasurer waiting to be installed; but Geoffrey refused to install them because his own election had not been confirmed. The aggrieved dignitaries appealed to the king, who had nominated them, and the king confiscated all Geoffrey's lay estates in England and France. Geoffrey, however, pacified his brother by a promise of £3000, and having got his election confirmed by the papal legate at Dover, he returned to York prepared to install the dignitaries. But his reception was far from cordial. On the eve of the Epiphany, 1190, be proposed to officiate at vespers in the minster. For some reason unexplained, when he reached it he found that the dean and the treasurer had begun the service. He peremptorily ordered the choir to stop and then began the service himself, whereupon the treasurer, who had charge of the cathedral lighting, ordered the candles to be put out. This was done, and Geoffrey finished vespers as well as he could in the dark. As a punishment for this insult, Geoffrey placed the minster under an interdict until an apology should be made. A day was fixed for this purpose, and the church was thronged with clergy and citizens. Geoffrey was willing to be reconciled, but the dignitaries refused to make any apology. A riot ensued, and Geoffrey could scarcely restrain the citizens, who took his side, from doing violence to his opponents, who had to seek refuge in flight. He excommunicated both parties and closed the church.

Richard was incensed with Geoffrey and forbade his confirmation, but this the Pope Clement III. had already granted, and Geoffrey again made his peace with the king in France by a grant of money and a promise that he would not revisit England for three years. During his sojourn in France he was consecrated by the Archbishop of Tours, August 18, 1191, and received his pall the same day from the pope, together with authority to require profession of obedience from Hugh de Puiset, Bishop of Durham. He then proceeded to England, alleging that he had been released from his promise of three years' absence, but on his landing

at Dover he was seized by the partisans of William Longchamp, dragged from sanctuary in the priory, and lodged in the castle. This outrage stimulated the revolt of the barons against the tyranny of Longchamp and precipitated his fall, which left Geoffrey (the Archbishop of Canterbury being absent) the highest ecclesiastical authority in England. There was no peace for him, however, at York. Hugh of Durham refused to make profession of obedience to him, and the strife with the chapter was renewed, partly about a successor to the dean, who had been made Bishop of Exeter, and partly about a collection for the king's ransom. Both sides appealed to the pope and the king, and during one of Geoffrey's absences the canons stopped all services in the minster, silenced the bells, stripped the altars, locked up the archbishop's house, and blocked the door leading from it into the church. He retaliated by excommunicating the mutinous canons and appointing other clerks to carry on the services. Commission after commission appointed by the pope decided mainly in favour of the independence of the chapter, and his position was not improved by his foolish attempts to insist on his cross being carried before him in the province of Canterbury, where his old adversary Hubert Walter had become archbishop. The king's attitude was fluctuating, being determined mainly by the amount of pecuniary help which he received or hoped to receive from Geoffrey. By the pope he was alternately suspended and restored. One of the best proofs that he had some right on his side is that St. Hugh of Lincoln persistently took his part, saying on one occasion that he would rather be hanged himself than pronounce sentence of suspension on Geoffrey.

After the accession of John he was deprived of the sheriffdom of Yorkshire, because he had not paid the 3000 marks that he had promised to Richard for that office. Geoffrey excommunicated the new sheriff and all his abettors. In 1200 he had a fresh quarrel with his chapter concerning the appointment of an archdeacon. Short-lived reconciliations with the king were purchased now and then by money aids, but in 1207, when John issued a writ from York for a tax of a thirteenth on all chattels, movable and immovable, to be exacted by the archdeacons from the beneficed clergy,

Geoffrey forbade the tax, and declared all who submitted to it excommunicate. None, however, dared to resist the impost, whereupon Geoffrey, having pronounced a comprehensive anathema upon those who collected and those who paid the tax, and generally upon all who robbed the Church, fled over sea and spent the remainder of his life in obscurity in Normandy. He died in 1212, and was buried in the Church of Notre Dame du Parc, or Grandmont, near Rouen.

Interest of Archbishop Geoffrey's career.

Thus ended the fitful and stormy career of Archbishop Geoffrey: a curious and instructive illustration of the troubles to which an English bishop at this period was liable, and of the various evils from which the Church suffered,—the evil of placing worldly men in high ecclesiastical posts, the graver evil of selling these offices to the highest bidders, the conflict of rights and interests between bishop and chapter, and the impossibility of obtaining any settlement of their relations, either by king or pope, without bribery.

Death of Richard I., 1199.

When King Richard met with his fatal wound at the siege of Chalus in the Limousin, Hugh of Lincoln was in Anjou on his way to see the king, and remonstrate with him for making a fresh demand on the Church of Lincoln. He had asked for twelve of the canons, learned and eloquent men, to be employed as his agents at the courts of the pope and the emperor, or wherever they might be wanted. With this request Hugh had indignantly refused to comply. He was near Angers when he heard of the king's death, and he then hastened to Fontevraud, which he reached just in time to receive the body of the king at the doors of the Church.

King John and Bp. Hugh of Lincoln.

Presently also John came there to visit the tombs of his father and brother. He was profuse in his promises of benefactions to the abbey, and of good intentions as to his future conduct. Hugh told him plainly that he mistrusted his promises. He directed his attention to the sculpture in the porch of the Church, representing the last judgment, pointing out that there were kings amongst those who were being thrust down to perdition on the left hand of the judge. John remarked that the bishop ought rather to have shown him the kings on the other side

who were being conducted by angels to eternal bliss, for it was their example that he intended to follow. In fact for a few days John overacted the part of humility and piety, giving alms largely, and returning the salutation of every ragged beggar whom he met. Those who knew him entirely doubted his sincerity, and their suspicions were verified by his profane behaviour in Church on Easter Day, when he made mocking jests at the time of the offertory, and during Bishop Hugh's sermon sent three times to him, desiring him to conclude, as he wanted to go to dinner. He did not communicate.

He was crowned in Westminster Abbey by Archbishop Hubert Walter on Ascension Day, May 27, 1199. The primate recited the old English law of succession, that no one had a right to the throne unless he was unanimously chosen by the whole realm after invocation of the Holy Spirit, and was duly qualified by his character and conversation. The coronation of the most irreligious king, except William Rufus, that ever occupied the English throne, was the last occasion on which the religious principle governing the right of succession was publicly declared. The archbishop being afterwards asked why he had made this pronouncement, replied that it was because he had a foreboding that John would disgrace the kingdom and crown of England. From the same feeling, no doubt, when he administered the oath by which the king bound himself to defend the Church, redress wrongs, and maintain justice, he adjured John not to accept the regal office unless he sincerely purposed to keep the oath. John answered that he fully intended by the grace of God to keep it, but he did not ratify his promise by partaking of the Holy Eucharist. He had indeed never communicated since he was grown up. The endeavour of the archbishop to fasten a sense of his responsibilities on the king's conscience may be compared with that of Lanfranc in the case of William Rufus.[1] Hubert Walter was indeed to John as Lanfranc to the Red King,—the only check upon his evil doings. On hearing of the death of the archbishop, which occurred in July 1205, John exclaimed with indecent joy, "now for the first time am I King of

Coronation of John.

Abp. Hubert a check on John's misrule.

[1] See above, pp. 64, 72.

England." Hubert Walter had taken the office of chancellor, notwithstanding the papal prohibition, and by him and the justiciar, Geoffrey Fitz-Peter, the kingdom had been well administered, especially when they could keep John out of it.

The death of the archbishop involved the king in a quarrel with Innocent III., the ablest and most ambitious pope that had occupied the apostolic see since the days of Gregory VII. Some of the monks of Canterbury, in their eagerness to maintain their right of free election, were too precipitate. The night after Hubert Walter's death the younger monks secretly elected the sub-prior Reginald, and despatched him forthwith to Rome to obtain consecration and the pall. Reginald, a vain and rash man, as soon as he had crossed the Channel vaunted his election. The news reached England and everybody was displeased; the king, who had destined John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, for the primacy; the bishops and senior monks, because they had not been consulted; and the electors themselves, because their nominee had betrayed their design by violating his promise of secrecy. All parties therefore appealed to the pope; but John meanwhile got the Bishop of Norwich elected and put him in possession of the archiepiscopal estates.

Abp. Hubert dies. Disputed election.

Innocent allowed the appeal to drag on for a year and a half. In December 1206 he delivered judgment. He ruled that the bishops had no right to a voice in the election. The only canonical electors were the monks, but the election of the sub-prior Reginald had been irregular; and the election of Bishop John de Gray was also invalid, because it had been made pending the appeal. The way, however, was open for a fresh election. Sixteen monks from Christchurch were at the papal court with full powers to act for the whole chapter. The king, indeed, had made a secret compact with them not to elect any one but John de Gray; and he had endeavoured, by plentiful bribes, to secure the favour of the pope's advisers. But Innocent was more than a match for the cunning of the king. He told the monks that to return to England for an election would be waste of time. It would be far better to make it on the spot, and there was

Appeal to Pope Innocent III.

Stephen Langton elected.

before them at that moment a man in every way qualified for the office—Stephen Langton, who was an Englishman, a cardinal, and one of the greatest theologians and scholars of the day. The monks confessed their secret compact with the king, but the pope scornfully absolved them from it, and they then, with only one dissentient, elected Stephen Langton.

Innocent wrote immediately to the king, requiring him to receive Langton as archbishop. John, furiously angry, threatened and blustered, and refused to have any dealings with a man who had dwelt among his enemies in France. The pope, however, nothing daunted, consecrated Stephen at Viterbo on June 17, 1207. John, finding that the monks of Christchurch intended to adhere to Stephen, seized their property, expelled them by an armed force, and committed the care of their house to the monks of St. Augustine. The pope retaliated by commissioning the Bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to lay the kingdom under an interdict if they could not induce the king to give way. Their efforts failed, and an interview which Simon Langton, the archbishop's brother, had with the king at Winchester was equally unavailing. A final entreaty of the bishops to John to avert the calamity of an interdict only exasperated him the more. He swore by his favourite oath, "God's teeth," that if the interdict was proclaimed he would expel all the bishops, clerks, and monks in England and confiscate their goods, and if any Roman dared to come to England he would have his eyes torn out and his nose cut off.

John refuses to accept him.

In March 1208 the three bishops published the interdict and fled the kingdom, together with Jocelyn, Bishop of Bath, and Egidius of Hereford. John seized their property and confiscated the revenues of the clergy and monks in their dioceses. The king cared nothing for the interdict, and heeded not the threat of excommunication with which it was followed. Nor indeed did the interdict press very heavily on the country, for the services of religion were not entirely suspended. Holy baptism was administered to the infant, and the viaticum to the dying; the dead were buried, though in silence, in consecrated ground; marriages and churchings were allowed at

England under Interdict, 1208.

the church door; sermons might be preached in the open air. In monastic churches the canonical hours were observed, and mass was celebrated once a week. Taxation was relieved by the confiscation of Church property, and the nobles dared not refuse their services to John, as he held hostages of them, and threatened frightful penalties to any one who deserted him. The two most successful expeditions of John's reign, one against Ireland, the other against Wales, took place when England was under the interdict.

Stephen Langton meanwhile acted with dignity and patience. The first five years after his election he spent for the most part at Pontigny. After the expulsion of the monks from Canterbury he committed the care and protection of the injured church to the Bishop of London. To the English people he wrote words of encouragement and wise counsel, and to the king he addressed warnings and remonstrance, offering to obtain a relaxation of the interdict if he would amend his conduct. His intercession also obtained some delay in the excommunication of the king.

Discreet conduct of Stephen Langton.

The death of the holy Bishop of Lincoln, which had occurred in November 1200, saved him from the grief of witnessing the miseries of John's reign. Even John treated him outwardly with respect, visiting him on his death-bed, promising to observe all his dying wishes and admonitions, and attending his funeral at Lincoln. Three years elapsed before the see was filled up by the election of the precentor, William of Blois, in opposition to a nominee of the king's, and after his death in 1206 there was another interval of three years, at the end of which, 1209, Hugh, Archdeacon of Wells, was elected. The king commanded him to obtain consecration from the Archbishop of Rouen, but Hugh repaired forthwith to Stephen Langton, and was consecrated by him. John was enraged, declared the bishopric vacant, and confiscated the revenues of the see.

Death of Bp. Hugh of Lincoln.

Next year, 1210, he summoned a large council of bishops, abbots, priors, and abbesses, knights-templars, and hospitalers, together with the stewards of manors belonging to the Cluniacs and other Orders, and exacted contributions from them for the Welsh war to the amount of £100,000. The Cistercians,

who had hitherto been exempt from taxation, were mulcted to the extent of £40,000, and forbidden to attend the general chapter of their Order. In 1211, after the Welsh campaign, which was successful, two papal envoys, Pandulf, a cardinal sub-deacon, and Durand, a knight-hospitaler, met the king at a council in Northampton, and tried to arrange terms of peace. He consented to the return of the archbishop and the exiled bishops and monks, but as he refused compensation for injury and loss of property the envoys broke off the negotiations and returned to France. Meanwhile many of the clergy, to escape the tortures with which they were threatened if they respected the interdict, fled to the Continent. The country was reduced to such a state of misery that in 1212 Stephen Langton, with the Bishops of London and Ely, went to Rome and entreated the pope to succour the afflicted Church and nation. Innocent now solemnly pronounced sentence of deposition on John, and invited Philip of France to expiate his own sins by driving the English tyrant from his throne; while to all princes and nobles who would join in the holy enterprise he offered the same spiritual privileges that were granted to those who visited the sepulchre of Christ.

John exacts large sums from religious Orders.

Innocent III. declares John deposed, 1212.

John had paid little or no heed to the threat of excommunication. He may have thought that it would not be executed, or that if it was, no great harm would happen to him, for his nephew, Otto the Emperor, and his neighbour, Philip Augustus of France, had been subjected to the same ban, and had come into no misfortune.

But he had not calculated the extent to which he had alienated his subjects, and the encouragement to rebellion which the papal proclamation would supply. Llewelyn, the Welsh prince who had submitted the year before, forthwith revolted. Presently tidings came of plots from various quarters. Like most irreligious persons, John was occasionally a prey to superstitious terrors, and he was thoroughly alarmed by the prediction of a hermit of Wakefield, one Peter of Pomfret, that by the coming festival of Ascension Day he would be no longer king.

John's alarm.

The sentence of John's deposition was published in France by the three bishops, and the king gladly and promptly made preparations on a large scale for the invasion of England. John, meanwhile, collected a large force which he posted at Dover and other ports, and on Barham Down near Canterbury. But he had no confidence in the fidelity of his troops. Ascension Day was imminent, and presently two messengers arrived from Pandulf, who informed him that an overwhelming host had assembled on the other side of the Channel, but that he might still save his realm by a timely submission to the apostolic see. Thus reduced to abject despair, John consented to receive Pandulf. On May 13, 1213, in the presence of the legate he promised that he would freely receive all the exiled bishops, and make restitution to them for all injuries and losses. On May 15, being the vigil of Ascension Day, he stooped to the lowest depths of degradation. He surrendered his crown, together with the kingdoms of England and Ireland, into the hands of the pope's representative, receiving them back from him, and promising, as the pope's vassal, to pay in addition to Peter-pence an annual tribute of 1000 marks, 700 being for England, and 300 for Ireland.

John becomes a vassal of the pope, 1213.

The deed of surrender was drawn in abject terms. Therein John was made to declare that, "inasmuch as he had in many things offended God and holy mother Church, and stood greatly in need of divine mercy, but had nothing to offer for satisfaction, except by humiliation of himself and his realms; therefore desiring to humble himself in return for Him who humbled Himself even unto death for man, he freely and voluntarily granted to God and His holy apostles, Peter and Paul, the holy Roman Church, and his lord the Pope Innocent and his rightful successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom of Ireland, for the remission of his own sins, and the sins of all his family living and departed, receiving and holding the said kingdoms from the pope and the Roman Church as a feudatory in the presence of the pope's official, binding his lawful successors in the kingdom to the same terms, and promising to defend with all his power the patrimony of St. Peter, and especially the kingdom of England and Ireland against all assailants."

Thus was John humiliated, and in the indignant language of the historian, Matthew Paris, "thus did he make a charter to be abhorred throughout all ages."

The next day being Ascension Day, on which, according to the hermit Peter, John would be no longer king, the unfortunate prophet was taken out of Corfe Castle, where he had been imprisoned, and by the king's command was dragged at the tails of two horses to Wareham, and there hung, together with his son; a punishment not only cruel, but undeserved, for, as Roger of Wendover remarks, the prediction of the hermit might have been considered as verified, since John had in truth ceased to reign by surrendering his kingdom to the pope.

Cruel execution of the hermit Peter.

Pandulf now crossed into France, taking with him £8000 as an instalment of £12,000 which John was to pay the archbishop, bishops, and monks of Canterbury in compensation for their losses. He informed the King of France that as John and his kingdom were now under the protection of the pope, he must desist from his projected invasion of England. Philip was naturally very indignant at this frustration of a design which had already cost him more than £60,000, and had been undertaken at the bidding of the pope for the remission of his sins. John was so elated by some successes gained by his fleet that he wanted to attack the French by an invasion of Poitou. But the English barons refused to follow him, on the plea that he was not yet released from excommunication. He was, therefore, constrained to recall the primate and the other bishops. Letters signed by twenty-four nobles were sent to them, bidding them return without fear, and promising the restitution of their property and compensation for damage according to the terms agreed upon with Pandulf.

Pandulf stops French invasion.

On July 16 Archbishop Stephen Langton, with William, Bishop of London, Eustace of Ely, Hugh of Lincoln, and Egidius of Hereford, with other clerics and some laymen, landed at Dover and proceeded to Winchester. The king met them outside the city, prostrated himself at the feet of the prelates, and with many tears besought them to have mercy on him and his kingdom. The bishops, in their turn, could not

John reconciled to Stephen Langton at Winchester, 1213.

refrain from weeping. He was then conducted to the Cathedral chapter-house, where he swore on the Gospels that he would reverence and defend Holy Church and her ministers, and that he would revive the good laws of his predecessors, specially of the holy Eadward. He also swore to make full restitution before the ensuing Michælmas to all who had suffered under the interdict, and he renewed his oath of submission to the pope and his successors. This done, the archbishop led him into the cathedral and celebrated mass; the king made his offering and received the kiss of peace.

Having now been absolved, John again proposed to invade Poitou, but the barons, especially from the north of England, declined to serve out of the country unless their expenses were paid. The king set out to punish the recalcitrants. The archbishop followed, overtook him at Northampton, warned him of his folly, and reminded him that he had sworn at Winchester not to proceed against any of his subjects except in legal form. John was furious and pressed on to Nottingham, but the persistent primate followed him there also, and at last induced him to fix a day when the barons should appear to answer for themselves in his court. Nevertheless the king proceeded as far as Durham, returning to London in September.

Meanwhile, events of lasting importance to the Church and nation had taken place. In August the justiciar Geoffrey Fitz-Peter had held a council at St. Albans, to assess the indemnity due to the clergy for their losses. The deplorable condition of the kingdom was discussed, and the justiciar undertook in the king's name to see that the laws of Henry I., which John had promised to observe, were put in force. On the 25th of the same month another great council was held at St. Paul's, London, when the archbishop produced the actual charter of Henry I. and read it to the assembly. The barons swore that they would fight to the death if necessary for the liberties and rights therein set forth, and the archbishop promised to render them all the assistance in his power.

Deplorable state of the kingdom.

The justiciar Geoffrey died on October 2. John exhibited shameless joy at being rid of this upright and able minister,

expressing a hope that he had gone to join the late archbishop in hell. He gave the justiciarship to Peter des Roches, the Poitevin Bishop of Winchester, who was unpopular, both as a foreigner and a subservient instrument of the king's tyranny. On October 3 John met the pope's legate, Nicholas of Tusculum, at St. Paul's, delivered to him the deed surrendering his kingdoms to the pope, and did formal homage to him as the pope's representative. The indemnity to be paid to the bishops for their losses was discussed at this council, and subsequently at Wallingford and Reading. A further instalment of 15,000 marks was paid, but the full payment was postponed from time to time, with the connivance of the legate.

Bp. Peter des Roches, justiciar.

In truth it was now becoming the policy of the pope to favour John in return for the surrender of his kingdom. The legate was authorised to fill up vacancies in benefices, and gave great offence by appointing many ill-qualified men, on the advice of the king's clerks and ministers, without conferring with the archbishop and bishops. Some of the parish churches he bestowed on his own clerks, without any regard to the rightful patrons.

The pope begins to favour John.

Archbishop Stephen lodged an appeal against these high-handed proceedings, but the legate employed Pandulf to thwart it. Pandulf depreciated the primate and his suffragans to the pope, representing them as too grasping in their demands for restitution, and opposed to the royal authority. John, on the other hand, was described as the most submissive and modest of kings, and deserving of much favour.

Stephen Langton complains of the legate.

The time was now come for all the powers in Church and State to unite in resisting the combined efforts of the king and the pope to overthrow the constitutional rights and liberties of the English people.

In 1214 John made a final attempt with the aid of allies to recover his continental possessions. It ended in a crushing defeat at Bouvines on July 27, and in October he returned to England utterly discredited, only to find his own subjects prepared to make a determined stand on behalf of national liberty.

John's defeat at Bouvines.

The interdict had been taken off amidst great rejoicing,

after lasting six years and three months. The barons, under the leadership of the archbishop, had held a meeting at St. Edmundsbury, where they swore that at Christmas they would demand the confirmation of the charter of Henry I., and meanwhile would prepare forces sufficient to compel the king to fufil his promise in the probable event of his endeavouring to evade it. John perceived that the net was closing round him. He hoped to find a means of escape by detaching the clergy from the patriots, and with this view he issued on November 21 a charter granting the chapters the right of freely electing bishops and abbots. License to elect was to be asked for in each case, but, even if denied or delayed, the election was to take place. The royal assent was to be asked after election, and not to be refused unless some reasonable objection was alleged and proved. This charter, which was reissued in the following January 1215, was attested by Peter des Roches but by no other prelate. The clergy were not to be taken in by the king's artifices; they had definitely cast in their lot with the cause of the barons, which was indeed the national cause, and they steadfastly adhered to it. Another attempt of the king to sow dissension amongst the patriots was equally unsuccessful. On March 4 he took the vow of a crusader in order to involve all who resisted him in the guilt of sacrilege. He also informed the pope that a revolt was being organised. Innocent wrote to Archbishop Stephen prohibiting revolt, but also to the king advising concession to all reasonable demands.

Meeting at St. Edmundsbury.

John tries to divide the national party.

Driven to despair by the desertion of all his supporters except a few personal attendants, and by the failure of all his devices to outwit his opponents, John granted the Great Charter, June 15, 1215. This famous document, which has been described by our greatest historian as "the consummation of the work for which unconsciously kings, prelates, and lawyers had been labouring for a century, the summing-up of one period of national life and the starting-point of another," was the joint product of the three estates of the realm,—clergy, baronage, and commons, associated to secure by one grand stroke the rights and liberties of every class in the community. A solemn religious

The Great Charter, 1215.

character was imparted to the document in the preamble, based on that of the charter of Henry I., declaring that the king was moved to issue the charter out of reverence for God, for His honour, and the exaltation of Holy Church, as well as for the benefits of his people, by the advice of the venerable fathers; Stephen, archbishop, primate of all England, cardinal of the Holy Roman Church; Henry, Archbishop of Dublin; William, Bishop of London, and other suffragans mentioned by name, after which follow the names of various lay lords and officials. By the first article the king promises that the Church shall enjoy its own rights and liberties intact, and confirms the charter already issued, and confirmed by Pope Innocent, granting freedom of election. This comprehensive article is the only one which deals directly with the Church, but the influence of the archbishop may probably be traced in the careful safeguards provided for the rights of all freeholders; and the importance attached to his judgment in all matters is indicated by his being placed on a judicial committee of twenty-five barons to try disputes about illegal fines.

Its religious character.

The remainder of John's reign was occupied in attempts to break loose from the obligations of the Great Charter, and to sow dissension amongst his subjects. From the pope he obtained a Bull annulling the charter, and a letter requiring the archbishop and bishops to excommunicate all disturbers of the king and kingdom. After some hesitation the primate and his suffragans published the papal letter, but they took no steps to enforce it. The papal commissioners, Pandulf and the Bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches, urged action, but the archbishop, who was on the eve of departure to attend a council, declined to do anything further until he should have conferred with the pope; alleging that he thought the letter had been written under a misapprehension. The commissioners thereupon suspended him from his functions, and on his arrival at Rome the suspension was confirmed by the pope, who had been prejudiced against him by some envoys sent from John accusing him of contempt of the papal brief, and of complicity in a plot to dethrone the king.

John's attempts to evade it.

Stephen Langton suspended.

The strength of the archbishop's influence is proved by

the disintegration of the national party which occurred as soon as he had departed. A few returned to the side of the king, some endeavoured by all lawful means to enforce the charter, others made overtures to the kings of Scotland and France. In the end John was declared to have forfeited the crown, which was offered to Louis, the heir of the French throne. He invaded the country and obtained considerable successes, but with the death of John, October 19, 1216, the supporters of Louis melted away, and he was soon compelled to make peace and withdraw. Langton had been released from suspension in the spring of 1216, on the condition that he would submit to the pope's judgment upon the charges brought against him, and that he would not return to England until peace had been restored. Innocent died in July 1216, before he had tried the case of the archbishop; the death of John in the following October, and the recognition of Henry III. as king by all parties in 1217, set Langton free to return to England, but he did not actually return before May 1218.

French invasion, death of John, 1216.

AUTHORITIES.—*Gesta Henr. II. et Ric. I.* (Benedictus), ed. Bp. Stubbs; Roger of Howden, ii. iii. and iv.; Ralph de Diceto, i. and ii., ends 1202; William of Newburgh, ends 1194; Matt. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* ii., Giraldus Cambrensis; Richard of Devizes, 1187-1192; Walter of Coventry, with pref. by Bp. Stubbs; Ralph of Coggeshall, *Vita Magna Sti. Hug.* (all in Rolls series). *Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard (Rolls series), vols. i.-v., of which the most useful are Margan, 1199-1212; Waverley and Dunstable from 1210 onward, and some notices of Longchamp in the *Winchester An.; Epp. of Innocent III.;* (Migne's *Patrolog.* ccxiv. ccxv.). Wilkins's *Concilia;* Rymer's *Fœdera;* Modern: Miss K. Norgate's *England under the Angevin Kings*, vol. ii.; Bp. Stubbs's preface to the *Gesta Henr. II. et Ric. I.* and to Roger of Howden; *Select Charters* and *Constit. History*, ch. xii. *The Early Plantagenets. Lives of Stephen Langton*, Dean Hook (*Lives of Abp. of Cant.*, vol. ii.), C. E. Maurice, in *English Popular Leaders;* Mark Pattison in *Lives of Eng. Saints.*

CHAPTER XII

RESISTANCE TO POPE AND KING

Henry III., 1216–1272. Abps. of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, 1207–1228. Richard, 1229–1231. Edmund Rich, 1234–1240. Boniface, 1245–1270

On the death of John, the legate, Cardinal Gualo—to whom Innocent had confided the care of the English Church in the absence of Archbishop Stephen—took prompt and energetic measures to secure the throne for the Plantagenet dynasty. On October 28 the little Henry, aged nine, was crowned in the abbey church of Gloucester by the legate, assisted by the Bishops of Winchester, Worcester, Coventry, and Bath. Bishop Jocelyn of Bath dictated the oath, by which he was made to swear that he would honour God and Holy Church, and obey its ordinances, maintain all good laws and customs and cancel bad ones, and rule with justice the people committed to his care.

Henry III. crowned by the legate Gualo.

The legate renewed the sentence of excommunication which the pope had pronounced on Louis of France. He absolved and blessed the army which finally overthrew Louis at Lincoln, and was the chief agent in making terms of peace after his defeat. On November 12 a council was held at Bristol, attended by eleven bishops, at which the Great Charter was confirmed. The new pope, Honorius III., warmly upheld the legate. He addressed a letter to the English barons urging that with the death of John all pretext for rebellion was at an end, and that it would be most unjust to make the innocent child Henry suffer for his father's sins. To the boy-king himself he wrote a kind fatherly letter, exhorting him to advance in wisdom and the fear of God, to

show reverence for the Church and her ministers, to surround himself with honest friends, and to listen to their good advice.

In truth, during the first two years of Henry's minority affairs both in Church and State were largely ruled from Rome. The letters of Pope Honorius, which occur almost every month, are addressed, upon a vast variety of matters great and small, not only to the legate but to bishops, abbots, priors, barons, including William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, the king's guardian. The powers of the Legate Gualo seem to have been almost absolute. He is authorised to fill all vacancies in bishoprics and abbeys with persons faithful to the king and the Roman Church. Accordingly we find him giving orders for the consecration of a Bishop of Hereford, appointing the Abbot of Beaulieu to the bishopric of Carlisle, and William of Blois to the bishopric of Worcester in defiance of the chapter. He imprisons thirteen clerks at Westminster who had used disrespectful language to him; he proceeds against all clergy who adhered to the faction of Louis of France, suspending or depriving all, whatever their rank, whom he judged guilty, often indeed on very slight evidence. As usual with papal agents, no small pecuniary profits were made out of these transactions. The Bishop of Lincoln paid 1000 marks to the pope, and 100 to the legate, for the recovery of his see; and other prelates, besides canons and lesser clergy, endeavoured to purchase the favour of the legate by large presents. Some of the monastic houses, including Durham, were now taken under the special protection of the pope, and had various privileges in consequence bestowed upon them. When the legate returned to Rome in 1218 "his saddle bags," says Matthew Paris, "were well stuffed with incalculable gains."

Great power of the legate.

Gualo was succeeded by Pandulf, Bishop-elect of Norwich, in September 1218, and although Archbishop Stephen had now returned to England the new legate seems to have enjoyed the same plenary powers as his predecessor. He is directed to settle a claim of the canons of St. Frideswide respecting the Church of Acleia (Oakley in Bucks), notwithstanding the existence of a royal order on the subject. He settles disputed elections to bishoprics in Scotland and Ireland.

Gualo succeeded by Pandulf.

Bishops are provided by the pope for the sees of Ely and Llandaff, and the king is requested to signify his assent. Pandulf lays the first stone of the new cathedral at Salisbury in the name of the pope. He corresponds with Hubert de Burgh, the justiciar, about all manner of secular affairs; Marlborough Castle must not be fortified; Ralph Neville, the chancellor, must not leave the exchequer, nor must the seal be removed from it. He and the treasurer must deposit all money in the temple, and must not pay out any without the legate's order. These and similar directions are all issued on behalf of the king, who is described as an orphan, burdened with debt, signed with the cross, and under the special protection of the apostolic see. Even his mother is warned on the same grounds not to embarrass him by demands for money.

In 1220 Archbishop Langton had so far reasserted his position as to crown the young king on Whitsunday, May 17, in Westminster Abbey, with all the ceremonies, some of which had been necessarily omitted at Gloucester, and on July 7 he presided at the translation of the relics of St. Thomas, which was celebrated with unprecedented magnificence. Such a concourse of pilgrims of all degrees and nationalities had never been seen in England before. He himself entertained them sumptuously in a beautiful building specially erected for the occasion, which was the wonder of all beholders. Twenty-four prelates assisted in the ceremony. Mass was celebrated by the Archbishop of Reims, who had on the day before dedicated the altar erected in front of the new shrine. To this shrine—which was a magnificent fabric on a stone base, six feet high, and enriched with gold, silver, and precious stones—the coffin containing the remains of the saint was borne in the presence of the young king and a vast crowd of spectators. The ceremony was followed by a sumptuous feast, and the archbishop published an indulgence of two years to all who should visit the shrine within the ensuing fortnight. Bishop Hugh of Lincoln was canonised, and his remains were translated in this same year. The remains of St. Wulfstan had been translated two years before to the new cathedral at Worcester, which was consecrated on

Abp. Langton at coronation of king and translation of St. Thomas.

the same day, June 18, 1218, by Silvester the bishop, assisted by the other bishops and seventeen abbots, in the presence of the young king and a large body of nobles and clergy.

Soon after these events Archbishop Langton went to Rome, when he succeeded in obtaining three important privileges—that the Archbishop of York should not carry his cross outside his own province; that the pope should not appoint twice to the same benefice; and that during Langton's life no resident legate should be sent again to England. Pandulf resigned his commission in the summer of 1221.

Langton secures three privileges.

On the death of the Earl of Pembroke in 1219 Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, had become guardian of the young king. A foreigner himself, able, ambitious, unscrupulous, he supported the foreign adventurers who had been employed in the late reign, and who held some of the chief fortresses in the country. He and his party endeavoured to thwart the administration of the justiciar Hubert de Burgh, who laboured conscientiously to enforce the provisions of the Great Charter. In this policy the justiciar was steadily supported by Archbishop Langton. At a council held early in 1223 the archbishop, as leader and spokesman of the barons, demanded the confirmation of the charter by the king. William Brewer, who had been one of John's evil counsellors, tried to evade the demand on the king's behalf, asserting the charter "to be invalid because extorted by violence." He was sternly rebuked by the primate—"William, if you loved your king you would not thus hinder the peace of the realm." The young king was much moved by the archbishop's earnestness; he acknowledged himself bound by oath to observe all the ancient rights and liberties of the people, and declared that he would strictly adhere to his engagements. It was, no doubt, with the view of checking the efforts of Peter des Roches and his partisans to get complete mastery of the young king that the archbishop and Hubert de Burgh obtained in this year, 1223, a declaration from the pope that Henry was now old enough to direct the affairs of the kingdom himself, with the aid and advice of his council. The archbishop and his suffragans were

He upholds Hubert de Burgh against Peter des Roches.

to warn all who had the custody of fortresses, honours, and manors belonging to the king to surrender them on pain of excommunication. It was largely owing to the courage and determination of the archbishop in imposing this penalty that a rebellion was subdued which had been fostered, if not instigated, by Peter des Roches, and in which the Earls of Chester and Albemarle, Falkes de Breautè, and other foreigners took a leading part.

Nor was the archbishop less successful in parrying the first attempts of the pope to enforce a new kind of exaction, which after Langton's death became a most intolerable burden. At the close of the year 1225 a papal legate Otho brought a demand that in every conventual or collegiate church the revenue of two prebends or their annual equivalents should be paid to Rome. It was craftily represented that the costliness of suits at Rome, which was much complained of, and was attributed to cupidity, was really a necessity owing to the poverty of the Roman Church, and that an annual provision of the kind proposed would remedy the evil. The archbishop submitted the demands to a council at Westminster. They were unanimously rejected as startling novelties; and much laughter was excited by the specious arguments employed to veil the avarice of the Roman court.

Resists a demand of the pope, 1226.

At a council held in Oxford, February 1227, the king declared himself to be of age. He dismissed Peter des Roches, who went on a pilgrimage, and for the next five years his principal minister and director was the justiciar Hubert de Burgh. Archbishop Langton died at his manor of Slindon, in Sussex, on July 9, 1228, and Hubert lost in him his most valuable and consistent supporter in constitutional government; for he had now to contend single-handed against difficulties arising from the weakness and waywardness of the king, the machinations of the unpatriotic party under Peter des Roches, and the ever-increasing pretensions and demands of the pope.

Death of Abp. Stephen Langton, 1228.

On the death of Langton the monks of Canterbury, having obtained the king's license, elected Walter of Eynsham, one of their own body. Both the king and the bishops objected to him as a man of low origin and morals, and mean capacity,

who would be useless alike to the king and to the Church. Both sides appealed to the pope. Gregory IX., who had mounted the papal throne the year before, was already engaged in the implacable strife with the Emperor Frederick II., which was to last throughout his pontificate. The king's envoys found that the only way to secure a favourable judgment was to offer the pope pecuniary aid in carrying on this crusade, as it was called. After a "detestable debate" on the subject, as the chroniclers Matthew Paris and Roger of Wendover call it, they promised a tenth of all movables to be levied on the clergy throughout England and Ireland. The question of the Canterbury election was then easily settled. The archbishop-elect was put under a theological examination by three cardinals in the presence of the pope. He was said to have answered all the questions put to him not merely ill but very badly (*non solum male, sed pessime*). He was, therefore, pronounced to be unworthy of the high office to which he had been elected, and the pope proceeded to appoint Richard, the Chancellor of Lincoln, who was recommended by the royal envoys, the Bishops of Rochester and Coventry, and others, as a man of eminent learning, piety, and unblemished reputation.

Disputed election and appeal to Rome.

Subsidy promised to the pope.

Richard elected abp.

The pope lost no time in exacting his profit out of this transaction. The appointment of Richard had been made at the beginning of Lent, 1229. On the second Sunday after Easter, April 29, Stephen, a papal chaplain, attended a large council of clergy and laity summoned by the king at Westminster. The nuncio represented that the war with the excommunicate and rebellious emperor was being carried on in the interests of the whole Church; and that it behoved all faithful sons of the Roman Church, "the mother of all Churches," to assist her in prosecuting this holy war. The King of England was already bound by his envoys to pay a tenth of all movables in his kingdom; and the nuncio now demanded the fulfilment of the pledge. The nobles, however, led by the Earl of Chester, flatly refused to comply with the demand. The bishops and abbots, after four days' deliberation, consented with no little grumbling, from fear of incurring excommunication or interdict. The nuncio then produced

letters from the pope constituting him agent for the collection of the subsidy, and arming him with authority to excommunicate all who resisted it. It was executed with merciless rigour. The tenths even of the coming autumn crops, that were still only in blade, were required. Many of the clergy had to sell or pawn the sacred vessels of their churches to make up the amount, and curses not loud but deep were uttered throughout the land.

Papal subsidy rigorously collected.

A league was soon afterwards formed under the leadership of a young knight, Sir Robert Twenge (who took the name of William Wither), for the expulsion of foreign ecclesiastics. He himself was the patron of a living, and his rights had twice been overridden by the pope, who had intruded Italian incumbents into the benefice. He complained to the king, and the king remitted him to the pope. Meanwhile the members of the league pillaged the crops of the Italian clergy, and committed other outrages for which the pope demanded their punishment by the king. The king, however, found the league was so numerous and powerful that he was afraid to proceed against it, and the pope also, after receiving a petition conveyed to him by Sir Robert Twenge from many leading men, including the king's own brother Richard, Earl of Cornwall, deemed it prudent to enter into an engagement not to interfere with the rights of lay patrons.

League for expulsion of foreign clerks.

The episcopate of Archbishop Richard, which only lasted two years, was not marked by any events of much importance. He successfully opposed, however, on behalf of the clergy, a scutage of three marks demanded by the king from all who held by barony under the crown. He appealed to the pope against the action of Hubert de Burgh in taking possession of Tonbridge Castle, the custody of which, the primate said, belonged by ancient right to the see of Canterbury, and at the same time he complained of the system of pluralities, and of the employment of bishops in secular affairs. The pope gave the archbishop a favourable hearing, and promised his aid in the redress of these grievances. Cheered by this assurance the archbishop set out on his homeward journey on August 1,

Short episcopate of Abp. Richard, 1229-1231.

1231, but died two days afterwards in the convent of the Minorites at St. Gemini in Umbria.

On hearing of his death the monks of Christchurch elected Ralph Neville, Bishop of Chichester and Chancellor of the kingdom, to the primacy. He was an upright and patriotic statesman, a friend of Stephen Langton and Hubert de Burgh, and supporter of their policy in upholding the rights and liberties of the Church and nation against the exactions of king and pope. As such he was not a favourite with either, and although the king assented to his election he endeavoured to remove him a few years afterwards from the office of chancellor. A deputation of monks was sent to Rome to advocate his confirmation by the pope. Ralph refused to contribute a farthing to their expenses as savouring of simony, and the pope refused to ratify the election, alleging, on the testimony, it is said, of Simon Langton, the late primate's brother, that Ralph was a mere secular courtier, hasty in speech and haughty of spirit.

Another disputed election.

The monks now elected John of Sittingbourne their prior. He was accepted by the king but rejected by the pope as too old and incapable. A third election of John Blundel, a Canon of Chichester, was also quashed. He was a mere creature of Peter des Roches, who had supplied him with 2000 marks to promote his interest at the Roman Court, and had solicited the emperor to use his influence on his behalf. The pope now required the monks from Canterbury who were in Rome to make an election, and as in the case of Stephen Langton, they were practically compelled to accept the pope's nominee, who was Edmund Rich. The choice was, of course, immediately confirmed by the pope, and to prevent further delay he sent the pall to England by the monks.

Three elections quashed.

Edmund Rich was a typical specimen of the mediæval ascetic. In personal austerity he exceeded even St. Hugh of Lincoln, and the only prelate of his time who could compare with him in this respect was Richard of Wych, St. Richard of Chichester, who had succeeded Ralph Neville in 1245. Edmund had been trained from childhood in habits of the strictest asceticism. His father had become a monk at Ensham. His mother, Mabel, wore

Election of Edmund Rich, 1234.

a hair shirt and stays of iron. The child solemnly dedicated himself to the Blessed Virgin by a kind of marriage ceremony, placing one ring on one of his own fingers, and another on a finger of the Virgin's image. He and his brother Robert were sent at an early age to study at Paris; they had to beg their way thither, and to live on very hard fare. In the scanty outfit of clothing with which their mother supplied them the hair shirt was not forgotten, which they were specially charged to wear three times a week. Edmund studied at Oxford as well as Paris, and became a teacher in both places, distinguished alike for his learning, his asceticism, and his self-denying charity. He rarely lay long in bed, but snatched sleep as he sat or knelt; for five weeks he nursed a sick scholar night after night, yet never omitted his daily lecture. He was prodigal in almsgiving, careless in collecting his fees. As time went on he devoted himself exclusively to theological study and teaching, and to public preaching, in which he acquired a great reputation. About 1220 he was made Treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral, but owing to his generous expenditure his income only lasted him half the year, and for the remainder he used to lodge with his friend and pupil, Stephen Lexington, Abbot of Stanley in Wiltshire, afterwards Abbot of Clairvaux. In 1227 he was busily engaged in preaching the Crusade in various parts of England, and his success in this work no doubt commended him to the Pope Gregory IX.

Edmund Rich became archbishop at a critical moment in the life of the Church and nation. The unstable king had fallen completely under the influence of Peter des Roches. Hubert de Burgh was not only dismissed but imprisoned, and his post as justiciar was filled by Stephen de Segrave, one of the Bishop of Winchester's creatures; the office of treasurer, which had been filled by Ralph Brito, a friend of Hubert's, was bestowed on Peter of Rievaulx, a nephew, or son, of Peter des Roches. The great seal was soon to be wrested from the honest hands of the chancellor, Ralph Neville, Bishop of Chichester. Richard, Earl Marshal, the principal leader of the national party, was driven by his adversaries into alliance with the disaffected Welsh, and in 1234 was mortally wounded in battle in Ireland, whither he had been drawn on false pretences by Bishop

The king ruled by Peter des Roches.

Peter's agents. The king was surrounded by greedy foreigners —Poitevins, Gascons, Provencals, Italians, Savoyards, who encouraged him in his extravagant tastes. He was constantly in want of money, and was continually evading or violating the obligations of the Great Charter. Any resistance to his will was treated as rebellion, and to meet it the chief fortresses of the kingdom, and the most important official posts, were put into the hands of the very foreigners whose hateful presence provoked the opposition. The king courted alliance with the pope, and the pope used it as a means of extracting money for his own needs. The twofold oppression of king and pope ended in producing a national revolt.

Royal and papal exactions.

The spiritual suzerainty of the papacy had always been admitted in England, and as long as subsidies were asked for purposes which might fairly be considered conducive to the general welfare of Christendom, the English Church, like others, acquiesced in the demand. Nor did the nation seriously resent the use of Church endowments to furnish incomes for high officials of the State, so long as they were natives, and honestly devoted to the welfare of the nation. But when the pope treated the kingdom merely as a fief, when he demanded large pecuniary aids in support of his own needs or enterprises, and when he bestowed rich ecclesiastical preferments on non-resident foreigners, over-riding the rights of lawful patrons, a spirit of national indignation was roused. The sight of their castles, their cathedrals, and many of their monastic and parish churches in the hands of aliens united laity and clergy in a common bond of hatred of the foreigner and determination to expel him.

Abp. Edmund supports the national party.

At a parliament held in Westminster on February 2, 1234, the king accused some of the bishops, and especially Alexander of Lichfield, of too intimate a friendship with the Earl Marshal. Bishop Alexander indignantly denied that friendship with the earl implied enmity to the king; and knowing that the charge was suggested by Peter des Roches, he and the other bishops solemnly excommunicated all who maliciously accused them, or who tendered counsel to the king's enemies, or disturbed the peace of the kingdom. They found an able and courageous champion of their cause in the new primate. He was

consecrated on April 2, and on April 9, after conference with his suffragans, he addressed the king in very plain language, as the spokesman and leader of the whole body. "My lord and king," he said, "we tell you as your faithful subjects that the counsel which you are now following is neither salutary nor safe, but displeasing to God, contrary to sacred law, and charged with danger to yourself and this realm of England; we mean the counsel of Peter, Bishop of Winchester, and Peter de Rievaulx, and their accomplices." After assigning reasons for this statement, the archbishop added that unless the king desisted from his errors, and made peace with his faithful subjects, he would promptly excommunicate the aforesaid evil counsellors, together with all other adversaries of peace and concord. The king, who was no by means destitute of religious sentiment, and was not so liable as his father and grandfather to fits of Angevin rage, meekly replied that he would defer in all things to the advice of the bishops. Peter des Roches was ordered to retire from court and confine himself to the duties of his diocese; Peter de Rievaulx also was dismissed, and the Poitevin mercenaries were sent out of the kingdom. Archbishop Edmund, with the bishops of Lichfield and Rochester, were sent into Wales to try and arrange peace with the Earl Marshal and the malcontents there. When they returned with the sad tidings that the earl had died of his wounds in Ireland, the king exhibited great grief, ordered his chaplain to say a requiem mass, and made a liberal distribution of alms to the poor. In addition to these acts of penitence he consented, by the advice of the archbishop, to grant the inheritance of the earl to Gilbert his brother, and to recall Hubert de Burgh and other honest counsellors.

Dismissal of Peter des Roches, 1234.

The amendment in Henry's conduct was short-lived. The marriage of his sister Isabella in 1235 to the Emperor Frederick II., and his own marriage in 1236 to Eleanor, daughter of the Count of Provence, involved him in enormous expenses and brought a host of foreigners—relations and dependents of the queen—into the country. The queen was brought to England by her uncle William, Bishop-elect of Valence, who speedily became one of the king's most confidential councillors. Peter des Roches

Peter des Roches and other foreigners recalled.

and his creatures, Stephen de Segrave and Peter de Rievaulx, were reinstated in favour, and very soon all the old evils revived in full force.

In 1237 the Pope Gregory, at the request of the king, sent Cardinal Otho into England to execute, as was alleged, some necessary reforms in the Church and realm. Archbishop Edmund reproved the king for having invited him without the knowledge and consent of the magnates of the kingdom. Nevertheless, he and his suffragans received the legate with all due honour and respect. As for the king, he bowed his head before the pope's representative until it almost touched his knees; he loaded him with costly gifts, and deferred to him in everything with such abject servility that men said he was rather the feudatory of the pope than King of England. Otho remained in England till the year 1241, and in the course of his stay extracted enormous sums from the kingdom on one pretext or another for the benefit of the pope. His claims were based not only on the spiritual authority of the pope, but also on his feudal supremacy by virtue of king John's surrender. Besides direct taxation, a vast deal of money was raised by the appropriation of canonries and rich livings to papal nominees. This practice culminated in 1240 in a demand addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln for provision to be made for three hundred Italian clerks before any preferment was bestowed on Englishmen; and in the same year, in a council at Reading, a subsidy of a fifth of their goods was required from the nobles and prelates to enable the pope to carry on his war with the emperor.

Arrival of Cardinal Otho as legate.

Pope demands money and benefices for foreigners.

The spirit of the archbishop was so broken by prolonged but vain resistance to the exactions of the legate that he counselled his suffragans to make a virtue of necessity and yield to the demand. He himself paid his fifth, amounting to 800 marks, and the other bishops followed his example. In the summer of the same year he could bear the strain no longer. He saw the Church despoiled of her property and of her ancient rights and liberties; his appeals to the king were met with procrastination, his remonstrances to the legate were derided, his

Abp. Edmund retires to Pontigny,

authority was thwarted or set at nought in every direction, his attempts to reform the monastery of Christchurch were met by open rebellion. He was weary of life, which was no better than a living death; he bade farewell to the king and took his journey to Pontigny, the favourite retreat of English archbishops in trouble. His health and his heart were broken, and he spent the short remainder of his days as a simple monk in devotional exercises of the most ascetic kind, and prayers for the deliverance of his country from distress which he had been unable to mitigate. He died at Soisy-en-Brie, November 16, 1240, and was buried at Pontigny. Seven years afterwards he was canonised, and in 1254 Henry III. offered humble devotion at the shrine of the prelate to whose counsels and warnings he had paid so little regard.

and dies at Soisy-en-Brie, 1240.

AUTHORITIES.—Ralph of Coggeshall, ending 1224; Walter of Coventry, vol. ii. (Rolls series); Roger of Wendover, *Flores* iv. (Eng. Hist. Soc.), ending 1235; Matt. Paris, iii. iv. v., ed. Luard, and *Royal Letters Henry III.*, ed. Shirley. *Ann. Monast.* i.-v., ed. Luard, esp. *Ann. of Waverley* and Continuations of Gervase of Canterbury and William of Newburgh (all in Rolls series); *Life of Edmund Rich*, said to be by Bertrand of Pontigny in *Thesaurus Anecdotorum III.* (Martene and Durand) and a MS. *Life* in Lambeth Library, No. 135. Bp. Stubbs's *Const. Hist.*, c. xiv., and *Select Charters; Relations between England and Rome during earlier part of reign of Henry III.*, by H. R. Luard.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHURCH AND THE PATRIOTS

HAPPILY for the Church and nation, men of commanding ability, courage, and force of character were raised up to effect the deliverance for which Archbishop Edmund longed and prayed. Robert Grosseteste had been made Bishop of Lincoln in 1235. As a scholar he had no equal; he had been rector of the schools in the University of Oxford, and had won the highest reputation there both as a teacher and an administrator. He ruled his diocese with vigour, suppressing or reforming all manner of abuses with a very strong hand. Every form of injustice and unrighteousness was abhorrent to him, and he firmly but respectfully opposed the encroachments, alike of the king and the pope, on the liberties of the Church. Obedience, he said, was due to the king as long as he acted rightly, and to the pope as long as his commands were in harmony with the teaching of Scripture; but royal edicts ceased to be royal if they were contrary to the law of right, and apostolic precepts ceased to be apostolic, if they were contrary to the teaching of the apostles and of Christ, who was their Lord.

Robert Grosseteste, Bp. of Lincoln.

When Henry tried to violently force the queen's uncle William, Bishop-elect of Valence, into the see of Winchester, Grosseteste rebuked the king for his tyrannical conduct, and threatened to lay his private chapel under an interdict. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, Boniface of Savoy, although himself an uncle of the queen, was persuaded by Grosseteste to support him in this resistance, and the king had to give

Opposes royal absolution.

way. When the see of Chichester became vacant in 1244 by the death of Ralph Neville, Henry tried to intrude into it one of the Poitevine party, Robert Passelew, a judge, who had gained a very evil reputation for fleecing the clergy to fill the royal treasury. The archbishop, however, insisted that before the election was confirmed Passelew should submit to an examination in theology. Grosseteste was examiner, and pronounced him to be utterly unfit for the office; the election was quashed, and the choice of the canons then fell upon the learned and saintly Richard of Wyche, the friend of the late Archbishop Edmund and of Grosseteste.

More important, however, than any particular acts of resistance to royal tyranny, was the influence of Grosseteste upon Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. The correspondence between them proves that they were on terms of intimate and affectionate friendship. The earl's sons were placed under the bishop's charge, and it was for Simon's instruction that Grosseteste wrote the treatise entitled *The Principles of Kingship and Tyranny*. This work has, unfortunately, not been preserved, but from the tenor of his other writings, and of his whole career, we can readily believe that it marked out very clearly the differences between the methods of a constitutional monarchy and an arbitrary despotism. The principles, in short, for which Simon de Montfort and the patriotic party fought and died at Lewes and Evesham were probably in great measure learned from the wise and high-minded Bishop of Lincoln.

His influence on Simon de Montfort.

Up to the time of his death in 1253 his was the guiding mind of the firm opposition offered by clergy and laity alike to the exactions of the pope and the king. In 1241, the last year of the legate's stay in England, another great effort was made to wring a subsidy of one-fifth of their goods from the bishops, abbots, and clergy. The abbots appealed to the king for protection, but in vain. The bishops postponed their reply to the demand until they could meet their archdeacons, who knew what the resources of the clergy were. The result of their conference was a positive refusal to pay the tax. It was wanted for a sanguinary war—war with the emperor who was the brother-in-law of their king; it was imposing servitude on the Church; they

A subsidy for the pope refused, 1241.

had already contributed a tenth, on condition that no similar demand should be made in future; their freedom of access to Rome would be imperilled if they contributed to a war with the emperor, through whose territory the journey had to be made, and it would be hazardous to impoverish the country when the king had many enemies with whom he might be involved in a costly war.

The legate dared not press the demand, but he tried to foil the action of the bishops by attempting to extract money out of the beneficed clergy of Berkshire. He summoned them to a meeting at which he tried to work upon them by threats and promises. But if he expected to find them compliant he was much mistaken. In their firm, dignified, and forcible reply we can scarcely doubt that we trace the hand of the Bishop of Lincoln. They could not contribute, they said, to war against the emperor as against a heretic, for although excommunicate he had not been condemned by the judgment of the Church. Moreover, the Church did not employ the secular arm except against heretics. As the Roman Church had its patrimony, the administration of which pertained to the pope, so had other churches their patrimony, which was in no way tributary to the Church of Rome. As in the language of law all things were said to belong to the king, but only in the sense that they were under his care and protection, not under his dominion or subject to his disposal, so all churches belonged to the pope, but only as the objects of his care and protection. When the Truth said to the apostle, "Thou art Peter," etc., He committed the care of His Church to the apostle but reserved the ownership thereof to Himself, for He called it "My Church": He said, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," not whatsoever thou shalt exact on earth shall be exacted in heaven. The revenues of many livings were barely sufficient to maintain the incumbents, and multitudes of poor people were perishing around them from want of food. Enormous sums had been collected from the clergy for the pope's war. It was notorious that often after these sums had been forwarded for the pope's war he and the emperor had made terms, and yet not a farthing of the

Reply of Berkshire clergy to the legate.

amount raised had been returned to the contributors. Finally, they could not meet this demand without injustice to their patrons, who in many instances had endowed the churches on the understanding that the incumbents would show hospitality to both rich and poor according to their means.

Meanwhile, the emperor, Frederic II., wrote to Henry remonstrating with him for acquiescing in the excommunication of his own brother-in-law, and for permitting his country to be made papal spoil. He demanded the dismissal of the legate. Henry, however, replied that he was bound to hearken to the pope and to obey his mandates rather than the behests of any secular prince; especially as he was a feudatory and tributary of the pope; thus "accusing himself," as Matthew Paris says, "by his base excuse." He did write, however, to pope Gregory, interceding for the emperor (which only excited the pope's wrath to a higher pitch), and he advised the legate to depart, which he consented to do in 1241, to the great relief of the nation.

Departure of the legate Otho.

But if there was a short respite from papal exactions there was none from the demands of the king, who was always needy, always grasping. In 1243, besides extorting large sums from the Jews (from Aaron of York alone he squeezed 4 marks of gold and 4000 of silver), he required costly gifts from the monastic houses, and if they were not deemed good enough he sent them back until he was satisfied.

The king's exactions.

At a parliament held in the autumn of 1244 at Westminster he asked for a subsidy on account of debts contracted in Gascony.

And now at length parliament took the first decisive step in the direction of coercive reform. A committee of twelve was appointed, consisting of six prelates, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Boniface), the Bishop of Winchester (William Raleigh), the Bishop of Lincoln (Grosseteste), the Bishop of Worcester (Walter Cantilupe), and the abbots of St. Edmunsbury and Ramsey, together with six laymen, of whom the chief were Richard, Earl of Cornwall, the king's brother, and the Earl of Leicester, Simon de Montfort. This committee was invested with full power to

Beginnings of revolt, 1244.

treat with the king. They demanded from him the confirmation of the charters and the appointment of a justiciar, chancellor, and treasurer, offices which had been for some time in abeyance. The king, as usual, promised amendment, but asked time for consideration. He was granted three weeks. If in the interval he selected such counsellors and executed such reforms as they approved, the committee would be prepared with an answer about the subsidy; but any grant of money would be made on the condition that it should be expended for the good of the realm at the discretion of the committee. The king still procrastinated and tried to win over the clergy by exhibiting a letter from the pope, Innocent IV., addressed to the bishops and all the clergy, enjoining them by his apostolical authority to relieve liberally the needs of "his most beloved son in Christ, the illustrious king of England, who had always proved himself devotedly attached to his holy mother church." The debate was carried on for six days. At last the king came in person to the committee, and passionately entreated them to yield to the pope's exhortation. He protested that his honour was their honour, and their honour his. The committee still said that they must consider the question, and the king retired in great vexation of mind. Some were now inclined to give way, but Bishop Grosseteste persuaded them to stand firm. "Let us not be divided," he said, "for it is written, if we be divided we shall all perish together." Finally, they decided not to give any reply to the king or to the pope until the allotted term of three weeks had expired. The king still tried to detach individuals to his own side by means of personal interviews, but in vain.

The crisis was rendered more acute by the arrival of a new papal nuncio, one Master Martin, armed with extraordinary powers to raise money for the pope, including blank schedules with the papal seals attached, to be filled up at the nuncio's discretion. He also brought a letter from Innocent to the clergy, charging them to contribute liberally to the urgent needs of the Holy See, and expressing a hope that he might be able to commend their devotion, and not be compelled to take further proceedings. The bishops and abbots held a conference.

The nuncio Martin.

They were between the hammer and the anvil, between the upper and the nether millstone, the demands of the king and of the pope. It was difficult to say which was the harder of the two. On the whole they thought the wisest course was to give a moderate aid to the king. Something might be hoped for from him in return for help; but from the pope nothing would be gained. Accordingly, both the clerical and lay magnates agreed to offer the king an aid for the marriage of his eldest daughter, consisting of twenty shillings from the tenants-in-chief on each knight's fee.

The nuncio Martin then tried to put the screw on for the pope. The prelates had complied with the petition of their temporal lord, and would they not assist their spiritual father, who was fighting for the whole Church against its rebellious children? But the prelates firmly refused. The poverty of the kingdom, they said, and the wars with which it was threatened forbade their consent. Moreover, when they had made grants before to relieve the Roman Church from debt, the money had not been expended for the benefit of the Church. It was reported that the pope was about to summon a general council. Surely that would be the opportunity for all the faithful sons of the Church to rally round her and bring their contributions to her relief. The burden should not fall upon one branch of the Church, but upon the whole body. That which concerned all should be approved by all. The nuncio stormed and threatened, but in vain. Wherever he went he conducted himself with the most intolerable arrogance, imperiously demanding costly gifts of palfreys or rich apparel from the heads of monastic houses, under penalty of suspension or excommunication if they were not sufficient. He seized the revenues of vacant benefices, and forbade collations to benefices of the value of thirty marks and upwards, until his cupidity was satisfied. The treasurership of Salisbury Cathedral he bestowed upon a nephew of the pope, who was a mere boy.

His intolerable arrogance.

In 1245 he received a solemn warning from the great council that he had better leave the country if he and his attendants wished to keep a whole bone in their bodies. The frightened nuncio invoked the protection of the king, who said that he himself was threatened by his barons because

he had not prevented the nuncio's depredations, and that he could scarcely restrain them from laying violent hands upon him. Master Martin saw that it was time to depart, and having obtained a safe-conduct from the king he secretly quitted the country with all haste, July 15.

He is forced to depart.

At the general council of Lyons which was opened June 26, 1245, a letter was presented to the pope in the name of the whole English people, setting forth the wrongs which they had experienced at the hands of their mother, the Roman Church, for whom they professed as dutiful children all respect and affection. They reminded the pope with what regularity Peterpence had been paid, and how liberally and cheerfully they had responded to all reasonable requests for subsidies. But now for many years past, in addition to ever-increasing demands for money, they had suffered grievously from the intrusion of foreigners into English benefices. These aliens could not be good pastors, inasmuch as they did not know their own sheep, and the sheep did not know them.

Council of Lyons, 1245.

They were, indeed, mostly non-resident, and drew more than 60,000 marks annually out of the country for their own profit; a larger sum than the whole revenue of the king. They wound up with complaint of the monstrous proceedings of the nuncio Martin, who had assumed greater authority than that of a legate, and exercised it in a more arbitrary way. Their wrongs and grievances had in short become intolerable, and with the help of God they would tolerate them no longer. They besought the pope to grant a favourable hearing to their petition.

Statement of English grievances.

After a delay of some days, in the course of which the pope pronounced sentence of deprivation on the Emperor Frederic II., he returned an unfavourable answer to the English petition. The proctors, Roger Bigod and William de Powic, were enraged, and declared that they would not suffer any more tribute to be paid to Rome, or the revenues of any churches, especially those in the gift of nobles, to be sent out of the country. The pope dissembled his anger and sent letters to all the bishops, requiring each to attach his seal to the deed by which King

Unfavourable reply of pope.

John had bound himself to send an annual tribute to Rome. The bishops did not dare to disobey this command, although (according to Matthew Paris) the king was extremely angry, and declared that so long as he lived no payment should be made to Rome under the name of tribute. The pope also insisted on all the prelates who were at the council of Lyons signing the sentence of deprivation pronounced against the emperor.

The wearing strife with king and pope was protracted for a few more years, without any decisive issue. Again and again the same story is repeated,—aids demanded, threatenings from the pope not executed, promises from the king not fulfilled, lists of grievances presented to pope and king, solemn renewals of the charters which lead to nothing. Pope and king, however, generally succeed year after year in extorting something from a grudging and discontented clergy and people. It may seem strange and inconsistent in Bishop Grosseteste, that in 1246 he was one of the collectors for a subsidy to aid the pope in his war with the emperor, but it must be remembered that, although Grosseteste was not blind to the corruptions of the papacy, and did not hesitate to expose and denounce them, he was at the same time a loyal servant of the pope, whom he believed to be the lawful head of the Christian Church. If then the pope was reduced to positive distress in his conflict with an heretical emperor, such as Frederic II. was reputed to be, Grosseteste could not doubt that all faithful sons of the Church were bound to relieve him. He says, indeed, in one of his letters, that to fail in this duty would be a violation of the fifth commandment.

Prolonged strife. Grosseteste and the pope.

Only four years later, in 1250, we find him at Lyons delivering the most impassioned address to the pope and cardinals on the prevalent evils of the Church, the avarice and immorality of the clergy, which he ascribes largely to the Roman court, in that it not only failed to remove bad pastors, but, by the system of provisions and collations, appointed men who were not pastors at all but destroyers of souls. The most important duties of the pastor, the instruction of his people in living truth, the reproof and punishment of vice, the relief

Grosseteste's speech at Lyons on abuses in the Church.

of the destitute, the visitation of the sick, could not be properly discharged by deputies and hirelings. Yet not a few parishes were subjected permanently to this evil, not only by the intrusion of aliens but by the appropriation of benefices to monastic houses, many of which claimed exemption from episcopal control. If the bishop tried to do his duty and to remove unfit men from the cure of souls, he was met by vehement and vexatious opposition, and the protection of the papal court was invoked by the offender, which involved at least serious delay and great expense. Unless the holy see exerted itself to correct these evils, the time would soon come when it would be deprived of all good things; and while it was saying "peace and safety" sudden destruction would come upon it.

He refuses a canonry to a nephew of the pope.

In this bold and outspoken address, Grosseteste was not attacking the authority of the pope, for which he always expressed the most sincere respect, but rather endeavouring to strengthen it by urging the removal of abuses. In like manner, when Pope Innocent in 1253 required a vacant canonry in Lincoln Cathedral to be conferred on his nephew, Frederick de Lavagna, Grosseteste refused to obey the mandate, and in a long letter to the pope's representative in England he explains the grounds of his refusal. "It is well known," he says, "that I am ready to obey apostolical commands with filial affection, and all devotion and reverence, but to those things which are opposed to apostolical commands I, in my zeal for the honour of my parent, am also opposed." And in the concluding part of his letter he expresses himself to the same effect in epigrammatic and paradoxical language, "In a filial and obedient spirit I disobey, I refuse, I rebel" (*filialiter, et obedienter non obedio, contradico et rebello*). The pope had exceeded his powers; "the holiness of the apostolic see can tend only to edification, not to destruction. These provisions, however, as they are called, are not for edification but for manifest destruction. Therefore they are not within the power of the apostolic see, they owe their inspiration to 'flesh and blood,' which 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God,' not to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who is in heaven." Thus did Grosseteste, with splendid courage and consummate ability,

endeavour by respectful disobedience to manifest his respect for the pope, and to lead him up to a higher conception of responsibility and duty. He defended the papacy against itself by refusing to acknowledge acts which were unworthy of its high commission. He died in the autumn of this same year, 1253. In him the national party lost their ablest counsellor, but he had lived long enough to inspire and train others, and especially his friend, Simon de Montfort, in sound principles of action.

His death, 1253.

In 1250 Henry had taken the cross, and on October 13 he had asked Parliament, on the authority of a papal mandate, for a tenth of clerical revenues for three years to enable him to go on crusade. The demand had been indignantly opposed by Grosseteste and was refused. At Easter, however, 1253, Parliament consented to grant the tenth, but it was not to be paid until the crusade should start, and was to be expended at the discretion of the nobles. In return the king confirmed the charters with great solemnity. He probably never intended to go to Palestine, and soon after this, having obtained a grant from Parliament for war in Gascony, he wasted it all at Bordeaux. In 1255 he completed his ruin by accepting the crown of Sicily for his second son Edmund from the pope, who regarded that island as a papal fief. For this empty honour Henry pledged himself to pay the pope 140,000 marks, under penalty of forfeiting his English kingdom. He confessed this humiliating compact before a parliament at Westminster in 1257, the Archbishop of Messina being present as the papal ambassador. The king declared that it had been made with the consent of the clergy, and to meet his liability he asked for a tenth of ecclesiastical revenues, and the incomes of all vacant benefices for five years. The bishops utterly denied any knowledge of the compact, much more any consent to it. Nevertheless they granted a subsidy of 52,000 marks; it was grudgingly granted and ungraciously received.

Increasing difficulties of the king.

The cause of constitutional liberty, alike in Church and State, had now sunk to its lowest ebb. The king's debts were prodigious. It was reckoned that in the thirty years since 1227, when he took the government into his own hands, he had squandered 950,000 marks. The aliens held high

official positions, drew rich revenues, and occupied strong castles. But the darkest time is that which precedes the dawn. All classes were now ready to fight for freedom and reform. Only the leaders were required, and now that the crisis had come they were not wanting. Foremost amongst them was Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. Appointed Governor of Gascony in 1248, he had now returned to England disheartened and disgusted by the conduct of the king, who had sent him neither the men nor the money he required for the defence of the country, and had listened only too readily to any complaints that were brought against him.

The famous Parliament of 1258 declared that the exceptional misrule of the king required to be dealt with by exceptional measures. A provisional government was formed, somewhat complicated in its composition; but the principal element was a standing council of fifteen, to act as a body of advisers to the king, and a check upon all his acts, together with two bodies of twenty-four to redress grievances in Church and State. Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, Fulk Basset, Bishop of London, and Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, were included in both committees of twenty-four. The Archbishop and the Bishop of Worcester also sat in the council of fifteen; and the Bishop of London was one of twelve commissioners elected by the barons to meet the council of fifteen three times a year.

The Parliament of 1258.

The king, who was reduced to beggary and despair, swore to observe these "provisions," as they were called, of the Parliament of Oxford. His Poitevin relations and followers, however, would not accept them, and fled the country, taking a vast quantity of spoil with them. In the summer of 1260 the king was released from his oath by the pope, Alexander IV. In December 1263 the questions at issue were referred to Louis IX., King of France, who gave his judgment in the following January in favour of the king on all points. By this award, called "the Mise of Amiens," the "provisions of Oxford" were cancelled, and the king was to be left free to enjoy the same power as before. Simon de Montfort rejected the award, and it was formally repudiated by the

Provisions of Oxford.

Mise of Amiens, 1264.

rest of the barons' party at a conference in the following March.

No other means of arbitrament now remained but war, and both sides prepared for it without delay. One final effort, however, for a peaceful settlement was made. Henry of Sandwich, Bishop of London, Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, and Stephen of Burghstede, Bishop of Chichester, held a conference with Simon de Montfort and other leading patriots, at which it was resolved that 50,000 marks should be offered to the king on condition that the provisions of Oxford were reaffirmed and executed. When the barons had formed their camp at Fletching, nine miles north of Lewes, the Bishops of London and Worcester proceeded to Lewes, where the king lay, with this offer and a letter in which the barons declared that in taking up arms they wished no ill to the king, but were determined to oppose with all their might those aliens who were his enemies as well as theirs, and indeed enemies of the whole kingdom. They found the king in the Cluniac priory of Lewes. He had arrived on May 11, the eve of St. Pancras, to whom the priory was dedicated. True to his habits of extortion, he had on the way wrung 500 marks out of the Cistercians of Robertsbridge, and made great inroads on the estates of Battle Abbey. He was indeed a strange guest for a house dedicated to St. Pancras, who was held to be the special avenger of all perjuries. False swearers who dared to approach his tomb at Rome were said to go mad, or fall dead on the spot. The perfidious Henry, however, spent two quiet days and nights in the priory. The saint reserved his vengeance for the day of battle.

Final efforts of the bishops for peace.

The offer and letter of the barons were received with the utmost scorn and contempt, and the bishops returned to Fletching with letters of haughty defiance from the king, his brother Richard, King of the Romans, and his son, the Lord Edward. Convinced of the righteousness of their cause, the patriots prepared for battle in a spirit of religious devotion. The Bishop of Worcester spent a great part of the night in hearing confessions, and in encouraging all who should fight manfully in the cause of justice to hope for remission of sins. Earl Simon himself

Devout spirit of the barons' army.

spent much time in prayer. All the combatants had white crosses fastened on their backs and breasts, both as a help to distinguish each other in battle, and as a token of the purity and sanctity of their cause.

Battle of Lewes, 1264.

The battle of Lewes was fought on May 14. The parliament which met after the victory drew up the new constitution which was to be in force during the remainder of Henry's reign. He was to be guided by a permanent council of nine, who were to be nominated by three electors chosen by the barons. These three electors were Earl Simon, the Earl of Gloucester, and Stephen Burghstede, Bishop of Chichester. The opposition to the king had been throughout a movement on behalf of justice, righteousness, and freedom against oppression and faithlessness, and the Church had taken a leading part in it from first to last. The great principle established by the victory at Lewes, and thenceforth never forgotten in England, was the same for which Grosseteste had bravely and persistently contended against both king and pope, that law is above the ruler, and that the sovereign who does not rule in accordance with law and truth must be restrained. In the words of a long Latin poem, written by a nameless author soon after the battle of Lewes, "Let him who reads know that he cannot reign who does not keep the law. If the prince loves (his people) he ought to be loved in return; if he rules righteously he ought to be honoured; if he goes astray he ought to be called back by those whom he has oppressed; if he will be corrected by them he ought to be uplifted and supported. . . . Law rules the dignity of the king; for we believe that the law is light without which the ruler will wander from the right path."

The important part played by the Church in this struggle for constitutional rights cannot be expressed better than in the words of Sir Francis Palgrave: "However powerful the nobles may have been, it is doubtful whether they would have been able to maintain themselves against the monarchy, if they had been deprived of the support of the abbots and bishops who were placed in the first rank as peers of the realm. The mitre has resisted many blows which would have broken the helmet. . . . It is to these prelates that we chiefly owe the maintenance of the form and the spirit of free

government secured to us not by force but by law; and the altar has thus been the corner-stone of our ancient constitution."

The victory at Lewes was indeed followed by the overthrow at Evesham, 1265, and the death of the great leader, Simon de Montfort. Yet the cause for which he and the patriotic party had fought was not lost. In the assembly which drew up the compact or "Dictum" of Kenilworth, 1266; in the Parliament of Marlborough, 1267, which embodied in statutes some of the most important reforms of the constitutional party; and in the Council of London, held by the papal legate, 1268; clergy and laity combined to restrain any excesses on the part of the victorious royalists. Edward himself, the victor at Evesham, learned to respect the principles for which Earl Simon fought and died, and to rule in conformity with them. He learned the lesson which his father was never able to learn —that the king's throne must be established in righteousness, by doing strict justice to all men, by giving to every class some voice in the great council of the nation, above all by scrupulous fidelity to promises, in accordance with the motto inscribed on his tomb in Westminster Abbey, "Pactum serva," —"Keep troth."

AUTHORITIES. — *Annal. Monast.* (Rolls series), ed. Luard, esp. Tewkesbury, Burton, and Winchester, and *Chronicle* of Thomas Wykes, Canon of Oseney. The first part of this Chronicle is based on the *Ann.* of Oseney, but from 1258 he writes independently, in the spirit of a moderate royalist. *Royal Letters Henry III.*, ed. Shirley; Matt. Paris, *Chron. Maj.* ed. 1259; Rishanger's *Chronicle;* Gervase of Cant. contin. (all in Rolls series). *Political Songs*, ed. Wright (Camden Society); *Robert of Gloucester*, ed. Hearne. For life of Grosseteste—his *Letters*, ed. Luard, and *Monumenta Franciscana*, vol. i. ed. Brewer; and *Ann. of Lanercost, Ann. Monastici* (all in Rolls series). Many more will be found in the *Life of Robert Grosseteste*, by Mr. Francis Seymour Stevenson, M.P. (Macmillan, 1899), a very thorough and scholarly work; Blaauw's *Barons' War; Simon de Montfort*, by Pauli; *Battle of Lewes*, by the present writer in *Archæolog. Journal*, vol. xii. p. 189; Rymer's *Fœdera;* Bp. Stubbs's *Select Charters, Constit. History*, ch. xiv., and *Early Plantagenets.*

CHAPTER XIV

THE MONASTIC ORDERS

THE course of Monasticism in England from the introduction of Christianity to the eve of the Norman Conquest has been clearly traced in the first volume of this history.[1]

Revival of Monasticism.

It was shown that, although the conversion of the English was mainly effected by monks, yet the Benedictine rule was at no time very strictly observed, and that from various causes by the middle of the tenth century even the knowledge of it had been lost. This extinction, however, of Benedictinism was followed in the latter half of the same century by a revival, in which the principal leaders were the Archbishops of Canterbury, Oda, and Dunstan, and Æthelwold, Bishop of Winchester. These reformers introduced a new and aggressive type of Benedictinism from Fleury, seeking not only to reorganise existing monasteries, but to supplant secular clerks by monks wherever it was possible. In a few cathedral churches which were served by seculars attempts were made to subject the clerks to the rule of Chrodegang of Metz, by which they were obliged to use a common refectory and common dormitory, although they did not take monastic vows. None of these attempts, however, had been very successful.

At the time of the Norman Conquest the cathedral churches of York, London, Exeter, Hereford, Rochester, Wells, Selsey, Lichfield, Dorchester, Thetford, and Sherborne were served by seculars. Winchester and Worcester were monastic: at Durham

[1] For references see Index to vol. i. under "Monasticism" and "Benedict."

the chapter consisted partly of seculars, partly of monks. Christchurch, Canterbury, was monastic in little else than name when Lanfranc became archbishop. The monastic dress was worn, but the rule was not observed, and hunting, hawking, and dice-playing were common forms of recreation. Lanfranc reformed the house with a firm but cautious hand, mindful of the Lord's saying that new wine must not be put into old bottles. He framed a minute set of regulations for its government, in the introduction to which he states that he had selected them from the usages of those monasteries which were held to be of the greatest authority. At the same time he did not desire to debar himself or his successors from making additions and alterations from time to time, since rigid adherence to a fixed rule was fatal to progress. Altered circumstances might require altered rules. Only certain main principles must be maintained intact,—faith, contempt of the world, charity, chastity, humility, patience, obedience, humble confession of sins, and penance for them, frequent prayers, and due silence. Wherever these essential principles were observed it might be truly said that the rule of the Blessed Benedict was kept. He increased the number of the brethren to 150, built cloisters, dormitory, refectory, and other offices, and placed the whole house under the rule of a prior.

Lanfranc's reforms.

Notwithstanding the laxity of rule in many of the English houses even after the revival of the tenth century, and the large number of churches which remained in the hands of secular clerks, the popular sentiment in England, as in Western Christendom generally, was strongly in favour of monasticism. The life of the monk in his seclusion from the world, his renunciation of marriage, and of all personal possessions, impressed the emotional minds of men in a simple childlike age as being the highest and purest form of Christianity. And as in England the earliest missionaries had been monks, so the most venerated names were those of monks,—Augustine, Wilfrith, Theodore, Bede, Dunstan.

If Lanfranc regarded the English monasteries as degenerate, William looked upon them as strongholds of national feeling; and while Lanfranc endeavoured to tighten discipline, William placed them under the rule of Norman abbots. The rules drawn up by Lanfranc for the government of

Christchurch, Canterbury, formed the pattern upon which all the great monasteries within his province, or under his influence, were reformed. In their main substance they were identical with the rule of Cluny which, since its establishment in the tenth century, had been regarded as the model house of the Benedictine Order. The Cluniac houses were centres of education and learning; they contained schools not only for children destined or dedicated to convent life, "oblati" as they were called, but also for boys, frequently of noble parentage, who were intended for active life in the world. And as some of the best libraries were formed within the walls of the Benedictine houses, so naturally amongst their inmates were to be found the foremost scholars and writers of the day, whether theologians or historians. Moreover, as the convent door was open to persons of every nationality, whether they came to seek admission into the brotherhood, or merely as travellers asking for shelter and food, monasteries helped in no small degree to strengthen the ties of Christian brotherhood between nations. The reformed Benedictine houses also supplied models of good government, in which the monarchical and democratic elements were combined; for while unconditional obedience had to be paid to the orders of the abbot or prior, the administration of the common property and of some of the internal affairs of the house was regulated by the votes of the chapter.

The rule of Cluny.

Monasteries were popular throughout the period with which we are concerned because they had not yet become corrupted by the accumulation of wealth, or by having survived the sentiments and ideas out of which they grew, and the needs which they were designed to meet. The highest form of Christianity was still supposed to be a life of ascetic retirement and devotion, and the most meritorious action on the part of any man who could not lead this life himself was to provide for others who could. Moreover, the founder or benefactor of a monastic house not only enjoyed the pleasant sense of doing an act to the honour and glory of God, but believed that he was providing for the spiritual welfare of himself, and of his relations past, present, and future. Amongst the best features of mediæval Christianity were consciousness of sin, a readiness to confess it, and an

Popularity of Monasticism.

honest desire to expiate it, and prove the reality of penitence by some definite act involving effort and cost. The foundation of a monastic house, or a donation to an existing one, was the readiest method of giving expression to these feelings. The man who was smitten with remorse for some particular sin, or oppressed by a sense of general sinfulness, and of the moral dangers in the midst of which he was living, might be comforted by thus securing the prayers of holy men for the welfare of his soul not only during his life but after his death. Whether his benefaction consisted of broad acres sufficient to endow a whole religious house, or whether it were only a few candles, or even a single taper, to burn before some altar, it had its value. Some earthly possession had been parted with, and a spiritual benefit was gained: the donor was so much poorer in this world, so much richer towards God. Sometimes the founder or benefactor of a monastic house would seek in it shelter and repose both bodily and spiritual, after a life of turbulence and strife; spending the remainder of his days in devotional exercises.

In addition to these directly religious benefits, there were many of a more temporal character, but eminently useful, which all men could see and experience. The monks were large employers of labour, and generally good agriculturists: their houses were hospitable inns, centres of education, dispensaries of medicine to the sick and food for the needy.

Battle Abbey.

Amongst monastic houses founded in England after the Norman Conquest the earliest and the most important was the great abbey erected by the Conqueror himself as a thank-offering for his victory on the very spot where it had been won. Standing on the hill of Telham, and beholding the English forces closely drawn around the Standard of Harold on the opposite ridge, William vowed that if God granted him victory in the coming fight, he would build a great minster to His honour on the spot where that standard was fixed. A certain monk William, surnamed Faber, "the smith," from his skill in forging arrow heads, had followed the Norman army from the abbey of Marmoutier by the Loire. He overheard the duke's vow, and besought him that if God should enable him to fulfil it the minster might be dedicated to St. Martin, the renowned

Apostle of the Gauls. The request was accepted: the victory was won: but the execution of the vow was delayed for four years, until all England was subjugated. Then William the Smith was sent over to Marmoutier, and brought back four monks from his old home to form the nucleus of the new brotherhood on the hill of Senlac. William decreed that the high altar of his abbey church should cover the exact spot where the English standard had been fixed, and where Harold had fallen in the day of battle. The site was little pleasing to the foreign monks. It was bleak and arid, and distant from supplies of good stone for building. They begged for a more convenient site. But William was inflexible. His abbey should be built on the spot where, by the grace of God, his kingdom had been won. He made light of the difficulties alleged. As for the want of stone, his ships should bring it in abundance from the quarries near Caen, and as for the lack of water, wine should flow more plentifully in his abbey than did water in any other house in England. And so the house began to rise.

But the site was undoubtedly an awkward one. The church being planted on the crest of the hill most of the conventual buildings had to be erected on the slope, supported on great vaults or undercrofts, increasing in height with the depth of the descent. From various causes the work went on but slowly, and the founder did not live to see it completed. The church was consecrated by Anselm in 1094, and the other buildings were then sufficiently advanced to admit about fifty monks, little more than one-third of the number originally contemplated. Nevertheless, it was a great abbey, alike in dignity and interest, in privileges and possessions. In this abiding and stately monument of William's great victory prayers were daily offered, in accordance with the founder's will, for the souls alike of the English and Normans who had fallen on the memorable day of St. Calixtus 1066.

Its dedication.

The Abbey of St. Martin of the Place of Battle was the full title of the house. Within the "Leuga," as it was called, an area of three miles from the abbey, the abbot was supreme. He and his monks had free warren on all the lands of their

manors: they and their tenants were exempted from tolls in all markets and on all roads passing through the king's lands. They had a right to capture deer or other animals in any of the royal forests through which they passed. The church had the privilege of sanctuary, and the abbot could pardon any condemned criminal whom he chanced to meet on his way to execution in any part of the kingdom. Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, 1147-1169, tried to assert his episcopal authority over the abbey, demanding the attendance of the abbot at diocesan synods, and the payment of episcopal dues, and requiring abbots-elect in future to go to Chichester to receive benediction from the bishop, and to make profession of obedience to him. The story of the strife, which lasted several years, may be read at great length in the Chronicle of Battle Abbey. It ended at last mainly through the influence of the king, Henry II., and Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, in favour of the abbey, which was declared completely free from all episcopal jurisdiction.

Its privileges.

Nearly contemporary with the building of the Conqueror's abbey "at the place of battle" was the foundation of the great Cluniac priory of St. Pancras at Lewes by William of Warren and his wife, Gundrada. Lewes, with many other possessions, had been granted to William of Warren. At the foot of the height on which the castle stood was a wooden church dedicated to St. Pancras. This, after the Norman custom, William and his wife removed and replaced by a church of stone. But this did not satisfy their religious zeal. They desired to found a religious house, and Archbishop Lanfranc encouraged them in this pious wish. Meanwhile they set out on a pilgrimage to Rome, but war was going on between the Pope Gregory VII. and the Emperor Henry IV., and the roads into Italy were not safe for travellers. So they halted at the great monastery of Cluny, then under the rule of Abbot Hugh, eminent for piety and learning. William and Gundrada resolved to make their monastery at Lewes an offshoot of this pattern Benedictine house, and they persuaded the abbot, though after some difficulty and delay, to send an able and pious monk named Lanzo to be prior, accompanied by three brethren.

Priory of St. Pancras, Lewes.

In truth, the Order of Cluny was what might be termed the

fashionable Order of the day, and Cluniac monks were in great demand. King William himself had petitioned Abbot Hugh for six, but in vain. William and Gundrada, therefore, were considered fortunate to have secured a colony of Cluniacs for their house at Lewes. It was by the importation of foreign monks, with superior learning and discipline, that the Norman conquerors aimed at raising the standard of the Church in England, which they regarded and with some truth as insular, barbarous, and behind the age. Hence the remarkable statement inscribed on the tomb of Gundrada, that she introduced the balm of good manners to the churches of the English :—

Intulit ecclesiis Anglorum balsama morum.

The great castle of Lewes, with its twin keeps upon the double-crested hill overhanging the town, and the Cluniac priory in the plain below, formed a vivid illustration of the two forces which the Normans brought to bear on the people whom they had conquered. On the one hand, they were overawed by military force ; on the other, they were educated and moulded by higher learning, moral discipline, and organisation until they became fused into one body with their conquerors, and were fitted to take their place among the leading nations of Western Europe. The priory of Lewes was the first, and grew to be the largest and richest, Cluniac house in England. "None," says William of Malmesbury, "excelled it in the piety of its brethren, in hospitality to strangers, and in charity towards all." It was reckoned as one of the five principal houses of the Cluniac Order ; its priors enjoyed the rank of high-chamberlain of the Abbot of Cluny, and often held the office of the Vicar-General for England, Ireland, and Scotland. It was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and, like all the Cluniac priories, was entirely dependent on the parent house of Cluny, of which the abbots had the right of appointing the prior, admitting new monks, and holding visitations. Novices had to wait for a visit of the abbot before they could take the full vows.

The exemption from episcopal authority, the dependence on the central house, and the excessive powers of the chief abbot, who virtually nominated his own successor, were contrary to the Benedictine rule, and constituted the weak-

ness of the Cluniac system. When the central house decayed the daughter houses, having no independent life, decayed also. Cluny began to decline in the first half of the twelfth century. In England the property of the Cluniac houses, being all alien priories, was liable to be seized by the Crown during wars with France. These drawbacks checked the spread of the Order in England. Most of the houses were founded before the reign of Henry II. The latest was Stevesholme in Norfolk, established about 1220. Among the more important were Castle Acre in Norfolk, founded by William of Warren; Thetford in the same county, founded by Roger Bigod in commutation for going on pilgrimage; Wenlock in Shropshire; Bermondsey in Surrey; Pontefract and Monk Bretton in Yorkshire; Montacute in Somerset, and the Abbey de la Pré for Cluniac nuns in Northamptonshire.

Other Cluniac priories.

It is refreshing and consoling to turn from the scenes of turbulence and strife which cast such a lurid light on the reign of Stephen, and to watch the establishment of quiet homes of industrious peace which was going on all through that distracted time. The Cistercian Order of monks, if not actually founded by an Englishman, owed to an Englishman, Stephen Harding, who came from Sherborne in Dorset, the most important elements of its organaistion, and in no country did it spread more rapidly than in England.

Origin of the Cistercian Order.

The Cistercians, like the Cluniacs, were an Order of reformed Benedictines. The Benedictine Abbey of Molême in Burgundy had been founded in 1075. Its abbot, Robert, endeavoured to enforce a strict and literal observance of the Benedictine rule; but his efforts were thwarted by the refractory spirit of his monks. With the consent of Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons and papal legate, he renounced his thankless charge in 1098, and migrated with Alberic the prior and Stephen Harding the sub-prior, together with eighteen monks, to Citeaux in the diocese of Chalons-sur-Saône. Robert was recalled, much against his will, to Molême in 1099. Alberic, who was made abbot of the new house, died in 1109; he was succeeded by Stephen Harding, who ruled for nearly a quarter of a century, dying in 1133. There can be no doubt that from the first he had taken a leading part in the foundation of the new

Order. "Foremost amongst the foremost did he labour with the most fervent zeal to establish the Cistercian home and Order," is the language of St. Bernard in the *Exordium Magnum.* The existence of Citeaux as an abbey independent of Molême was recognised by a Bull of Pope Paschal II. in 1100, and the first regulations of the new Order were drawn up soon afterwards. As a protest against the laxity which had become prevalent in the Cluniac Order they aimed at reviving the old Benedictine rule in its most austere form, and with the strictest adherence to every particular of it. The garments of the monks and the coverings of their beds were to be of the plainest and coarsest kind; the vestments used in church were to be of the simplest material; the altar cloths were to be of plain linen; the censers of brass or iron; only one candlestick, made of iron, was permitted on the altar; the chalice was to be of silver gilt, the crucifix of painted wood. In founding new houses the most remote and desolate sites were to be selected. That the professed brethren might devote themselves exclusively to worship and study, lay brothers, called *conversi*, were to be associated with them to discharge every kind of secular work, skilled or unskilled, some serving as herdsmen or farm labourers, others as carpenters, masons, smiths, and workers in metal. To these were added in time scribes, architects, and painters, especially in glass; and amongst artists of this kind might sometimes be found men of rank and learning. At first, however, all manner of ornament was prohibited in the fabrics of the churches, as well as in their fittings and furniture. Not only were sculpture and carving excluded, but even the introduction of a triforium between the arches and roofs of nave or choir was forbidden. There were to be no superfluous pinnacles and turrets, and only one low central tower was permitted.

The admission of St. Bernard into Citeaux in 1113 with thirty companions gave a fresh impulse to the life of the house. The rigour of Stephen Harding's rule had repelled many, but Bernard had the art of winning men over to love the austere mode of life to which he himself was devoted. The numbers rapidly increased at Citeaux, and in less than two years four new houses of the Order were established, La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux (which became the home of Bernard), and Morimond.

The supremacy of Citeaux, however, was strictly assured. This supremacy, together with the rights retained by all parent houses over their daughter houses, was a peculiar feature in Cistercianism, which marked it off as a distinct Order from the Benedictine, and became in time a source of weakness. In the course of the next twenty years many bishops were drawn from the Cistercian Order, and in 1145 Bernard, a Cistercian monk of St. Anastasius, was elevated to the papal throne as Eugenius III. Innocent II. had granted various privileges to the Cistercians, including exemption from tithes of lands cultivated by them or at their cost. Eugenius III. confirmed these privileges, and added that of permission to celebrate mass with closed doors during an interdict.

Some of the original simplicity and austerity of the Order had begun to wear off when the first settlement was made in England by a little company of monks from L'Aumone in the diocese of Chartres. They planted themselves in 1128 at Waverley, near Farnham in Surrey, with the aid of William Giffard, Bishop of Winchester, who gave them two acres of meadow, with pannage, fuel, and other necessaries, out of the woods of Farnham. First settlement in England.

In the course of twenty years Waverley gave birth to five other Cistercian houses—Garendon in Leicestershire, Ford in Dorset, Thame and Bruern in Oxfordshire, Combe in Warwickshire. But the largest and most important settlements were in the north of England. For this there were two reasons. The wild and desolate tracts of country which abounded in the north were attractive to those who sought, in obedience to their rule, to plant their houses in the most secluded sites. And a second reason for preferring the northern region was that the older Orders had preoccupied much of the ground in the south. The fame of Rivaulx in Yorkshire so completely overshadowed that of Waverley, that by some of the early historians of the Cistercian Order the first introduction of it into England is attributed to the founder of Rivaulx. The claim of Waverley was ignored or overlooked. The importance of Rivaulx was no doubt enhanced by the fact that it was colonised direct from Clairvaux under the direction of the great St. Bernard. William, an Englishman of good birth and educa- Settlement in the north. Rivaulx.

tion, becoming weary of the world, its honours and its troubles, had retired to serve God at Clairvaux, where he made great progress in holiness of life and sacred learning, under the guidance of the holy Bernard. Anxious to extend the religious life to distant lands, and especially to England, where he thought it had become feeble, Bernard sent William in 1131, accompanied by certain monks, with a letter to the king, Henry I., praying him to assist these emissaries as messengers of the Lord in reclaiming for Him those who had been taken captive by Satan. Henry received them graciously, and granted them free permission to preach their message of salvation.

William, it is said, by his inspired eloquence and wonderful sanctity of life, turned many from sin into the way of righteousness. Amongst others who fell under the spell of his influence was a Yorkshire nobleman, Walter Espec. He had already, in 1122, founded a priory for Austin canons at Kirkham in memory of his son, who had been killed there by a fall from his horse; and he now determined to establish a home for the Cistercian visitors from which, as from a strong fortress, they might go forth day by day to do battle with the prince of darkness. The site which he selected was in a deep narrow valley of the river Rye, near Helmsley, in the north riding of Yorkshire, and it is described by the Cistercian Chronicle, as "a place of horror and desolation" (*in loco horroris et vastæ solitudinis*). Walter endowed his house of Rivaulx, as it came to be called, with nine carucates of land, together with the manor of Helmsley, and wood and pannage in the forest. To these donations he afterwards added Bilderdale in 1145. Ailred, the third Abbot of Rivaulx, describes the founder and patron as a splendid type of manliness and strength, with a gigantic frame, thick black hair, broad features, and a voice like a trumpet. He was one of the leading commanders in the battle of the Standard in 1138, and after a life of vigorous action he retired to his own Priory of Kirkham, where he died in 1153, the year also of St. Bernard's death.

Under the rule of the third abbot Ailred, a man who united holiness of life with learning and administrative ability, Rivaulx rapidly grew into a great house, and became the

parent of four others—Melrose, the first house of the Order established in Scotland, Warden in Bedfordshire, Revesby in Lincolnshire, and Rufford in Nottinghamshire. Melrose in its turn gave birth to Holme Cultram in Cumberland, and Warden to Sawtrey in Huntingdonshire, and Sibton in Suffolk.

Fountains, the greatest abbey in the north of England, although not the direct offspring of Rivaulx, owed its origin to that reforming spirit which was excited by the example of the holy and austere brethren who had come from over the sea to settle in the lonely Yorkshire dale. Some of the monks in the great Benedictine Abbey of St. Mary's at York desired to introduce changes based on the Cistercian pattern. The reforming party were shocked at the neglect of their founder's rule as to food and hours of silence. But this was not all. The rule of St. Benedict aimed at a strict and literal observance of our Lord's precepts: "If a man smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also." "Whoso hateth not his father and mother, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." "Whosoever he be that hateth not all that he hath . . . and taketh not up his cross and cometh after me, he cannot be my disciple." "Our practice," said the reformers, "is clean contrary to these precepts. We give way to anger and strife, we covet all manner of things, we try to seize the property of others, we seek to regain our own by litigation, we defend fraud and lies, we follow the motions of the flesh, we live for ourselves, we please ourselves, we glory in our wealth, and grow fat on the labours of others." Thus their consciences were thoroughly uneasy, they felt ashamed of their position, they seemed to themselves to be hypocrites; they were haunted by the saying of the Lord, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." There were only two possible remedies for this state of things—reformation or secession.

Fountains.

The abbot, who was aged and old-fashioned, and the majority of the monks were firmly opposed to the reformers. The latter, with their leader Prior Richard, appealed to Thurstan, Archbishop of York, who promised to help them, and fixed a day for visiting the abbey. When he arrived with

a train of learned clerks, he was met at the door of the chapter-house by the abbot and a crowd of monks, who forbade him to enter unless he dismissed the secular canons who accompanied him. This he refused to do, alleging that it was impossible for him to act in such an important matter without discreet counsellors. A tumult arose; the archbishop and his company tried to force their way into the chapter-house; the monks drove them back. At length the archbishop, having calmed the combatants, solemnly laid the church under an interdict. The thirteen reforming monks now formally seceded from St. Mary's, and were lodged for a few months in Archbishop Thurstan's palace. At the ensuing Christmas, which Thurstan kept at Ripon, he assigned to the monks a desolate place in Skeldale, full of rocks and thorns, more fitted, it was said, to be a lair of wild beasts than an abode of man. It was a severe test of the sincerity and courage of the monks, but they did not shrink from it. Richard the prior was chosen abbot. Thurstan confirmed their choice, and departed after he had blessed them, leaving them to their dreary solitude. Here they endured great hardships for several months; for there were as yet no buildings—a large elm tree was their only shelter. But they made up their minds that the Cistercian rule was the one they would adopt, and they despatched a letter to St. Bernard, entreating him to admit them into the Order. He wrote them an encouraging reply, and sent Geoffrey, a monk of Clairvaux, to instruct them in the Cistercian usages, and they began to erect some buildings under his direction. He was much impressed by their docility, their ready obedience, their patience under poverty and trials, their charity and faith.

For two years they suffered much want and hardship. During a season of famine they were reduced to supporting life on a decoction made from the leaves of their elm tree. Their numbers increased, but there was no corresponding increase of money or gifts. In the extremity of their destitution they thought of migrating to France. They begged St. Bernard to receive them, and he had actually assigned them a spot called Longué, in the diocese of Langres, when the turn came in the tide of their fortune. Hugh, Dean of York, joined them, bringing with him money and books, and his arrival

was soon followed by two canons of York, who came with all their possessions.

After this the tide of benefactions continued to flow steadily, until Fountains became one of the wealthiest abbeys in the north of England. Its third abbot, Henry Murdac, who had been trained under St. Bernard at Clairvaux, brought the discipline of Fountains up to the highest standard, while he also increased the wealth and quickened the energies of the house to such an extent that five daughter houses were founded during his rule. He was a vehement opponent of William Fitz-Herbert, who had been elected Archbishop of York in 1140.[1] William was suspended by the pope, Eugenius III., in 1146, and some of his supporters in revenge attacked Fountains, and set the house on fire. The energetic abbot, however, soon replaced the ruins by handsomer buildings and, on the deprivation of Fitz-Herbert by the pope in 1147, Murdac was appointed to the see of York. He continued to exercise a vigorous control over the abbey, and was in fact practically abbot, the three abbots who followed him in quick succession being appointed under his influence and ruling under his direction.

Henry Murdac, abbot.

Eight houses were the direct offspring of Fountains—Newminster near Morpeth in Northumberland, Kirkstead and Louth Park in Lincolnshire, Woburn in Bedfordshire, Lyse in Norway, colonised in 1146 by the express desire of the Bishop of Bergen, who had paid a visit to Fountains in the previous year, Kirkstall near Leeds, Vaudey in Lincolnshire, and lastly Meaux near Hull in Yorkshire. The progeny of Fountains was completed by the addition of three grandchildren—Pipewell in Northamptonshire, Roche and Sawley in Yorkshire, which were all the offspring of Newminster, the eldest daughter of Fountains.

Offspring of Fountains.

Meanwhile the movement was spreading into South Wales and the adjacent English counties. Tintern on the Wye was colonised from L'Aumone in 1131, and from Tintern sprang Kingswood in Gloucestershire in 1139. Whitland, in what is now Carmarthenshire, was planted direct from Clairvaux in 1140, and Margan in Glamorganshire in 1147.

In this same year the Cistercians received a great accession

[1] See above, p. 151.

of strength, and especially in England, by the absorption into their ranks of another and an older Order—that of Savigny, founded in the diocese of Avranches in 1112 by Vital de Mortain, who had been living for seven years as a recluse in the forests of Savigny. The Order, like that of Citeaux, was a kind of reformed Benedictinism; but, after the death of St. Vital in 1122, it seems to have lacked a superior of commanding ability: difficulties arose in maintaining discipline amongst the daughter houses, of which there were no less than thirteen in England, and Serlo, the fourth abbot, determined to surrender the order to Citeaux. This transaction was accomplished at the Great Chapter held at Citeaux in 1147 under the presidency of Pope Eugenius III. Of the thirteen English houses thus transferred from Savigny to Citeaux, by far the most important were Furness in Lancashire, Quarr in the Isle of Wight, and Byland in Yorkshire. The former, which was the earliest and the greatest house of the Order of Savigny in England, strenuously resisted the change, but in a Bull of Eugenius III., dated April 10, 1148, it is included amongst the abbeys which had surrendered. The possession of its large estates and privileges was afterwards confirmed, including the right of electing the bishop of the Isles. This right had been originally conferred by a charter of Olaf I., King of Man, in 1134, together with a gift of land in the island upon which the monks of Furness established the abbey of Rushen or Balasalla in 1138.

Order of Savigny.

By the year 1152 there were fifty Cistercian houses in England. Many of them were very wealthy, and had fallen away from the original simplicity and severity of the Order. They were great breeders of sheep and cattle, and had a large trade in wool. A decree was issued by the general chapter held in that year that no more Cistercian houses should be founded in England; but this prohibition was only a temporary check, although they ceased to be rapidly multiplied, as in the earlier days when enthusiasm for the Order was in its height. Three houses were established in the reign of Henry II.—Roberts-bridge near Battle in Sussex in 1176; Conway in Wales in 1185; Cleeve in Somerset in 1188.

One of the most beautiful in the south of England,

Beaulieu, near Southampton in the New Forest, owed its origin in 1201 to the irreligious King John. According to the contemporary life of St. Hugh of Lincoln, the king was moved to this act of piety and penance for past misdeeds by the holy bishop on his deathbed. A more detailed story, related by another chronicler, is not incompatible with the statement of St. Hugh's biographer. The Cistercians had been oppressed by John,[1] and some abbots of the Order came to the Parliament at Lincoln to supplicate relief. The king flew into one of his mad fits of rage, and ordered them to be trampled to death by horses. His officials shrank from executing the brutal command. On the following night the king dreamed that he was brought up for trial before a judge who had the suppliant abbots for his assessors. The abbots were ordered by the judge to scourge the king on his back; and when he woke he felt the effects of the flagellation. He related his dream to a bishop, who told him that he had been thus mercifully warned by God of the doom that awaited him in the other world if he persisted in his cruelty. Thereupon the king sent for the trembling abbots, who expected to be dragged to execution, and having craved their pardon announced his intention of founding an abbey in token of penitence.

Beaulieu Abbey, 1201.

The beautiful Abbey of Netley, on the other side of Southampton, was founded by Henry III. in 1239, and the first body of monks was brought thither from Beaulieu.

The last Cistercian house of any importance established in England was Vale Royal in Cheshire, founded by Edward I. in fulfilment of a vow made when he was in imminent danger of shipwreck on his return from Palestine in 1266. His escape, deemed miraculous, was attributed to the Blessed Virgin, whose protection he had invoked on the voyage. He himself laid the first stone of the church in 1277, and presented various precious relics, including a fragment of the Cross, which he had brought from Jerusalem.

Vale Royal, 1266.

There is one religious Order which specially claims our interest as having been founded by an Englishman, in England,

[1] See above, p. 213.

and entirely confined to this country. Gilbert of Sempringham, born about 1083, was the son of a Norman knight by an English mother. His father was wealthy, and had estates in Lincolnshire. Gilbert was not regarded with much favour at home; his figure was ungainly, he had little bodily vigour, and was inclined to be indolent. But having been sent to study in Paris his mental powers rapidly developed, until he gained a considerable reputation as a scholar and teacher. On his return to England he set up a school for the instruction of boys and girls near his own home. Although he was not yet ordained his father gave him the revenues of two churches of which he was patron—Sempringham and Tivington. Gilbert bestowed the income derived from Tivington on the poor, living himself for many years as a clerk in the household of Robert Bloet, Bishop of Lincoln, and his successor Bishop Alexander. A project to found a religious order for women was extended to include men also. The rule which he composed for women was based on the Cistercian, the rule for men on that of the Augustinian canons. His first house was established with the help of Bishop Alexander at Sempringham in 1139, the second at Haverholme in the same year.

St. Gilbert of Sempringham, 1139.

In the course of his life, which was prolonged to extreme old age, Gilbert founded thirteen houses—four for men only, and nine for men and women. In these double monasteries the dwellings of the men and women were kept far apart, but the church was common to both. The chief government of his Order was conferred on him by Pope Eugenius III., but after a short time he surrendered it to a former pupil of his own, Roger of Sempringham, making the vow of obedience to him, and receiving at his hand the habit of his Order, a black cassock with a white cloak over it. Although he supported Thomas Becket in his strife with Henry II., his extreme humility and sanctity of life procured him the respect of the king and Queen Eleanor, and indeed of the whole court. He practised the most rigorous abstinence, never eating any meat, and in Lent not even fish, while at every meal a vessel was placed by his side called "The plate of Jesus Christ," in which he put some of the best portions of his meagre fare to be given

to the poor Notwithstanding his excessive asceticism he lived to the age of a hundred and five or six. He was buried in the church at Sempringham, and was canonised by Pope Innocent III. in 1202, mainly through the influence of Archbishop Hubert Walter.

The Order of Augustinian or Austin Canons, whose rule was adopted by St. Gilbert, originated with some clergy at Avignon as early as 1038, but their first house in England was planted at Colchester in 1105. They were called Canons Regular, as distinguished from Canons Secular, because they lived under a rule (*regula*), being shaven like monks, renouncing personal property, and having a common dormitory and refectory. Their two special designations were "Black Canons," from the black habit which they wore, and "Augustinian or Austin Canons," from St. Augustine of Hippo, because their rule was framed from a study of his writings, and their mode of life resembled that which he had instituted amongst his clergy. Their homes in England grew to be very numerous, and at the time of the dissolution exceeded even the Cistercians in number; but many of them were very small. Among the most important belonging to the period with which we are concerned were St. Saviour's, Southwark, and St. Bartholmew's, Smithfield; Carlisle (the only cathedral in England served by canons of this Order); Twineham or Christchurch in Hampshire; Dunstable, founded by Henry I. about 1133, and Waltham in Essex, originally founded by Harold for secular canons, and refounded for Augustinians by Henry II. in 1177. Augustinian Canons.

Another order of Canons Regular was that of "White Canons," as they were called, from their white habits, or "Premonstratensians," from Premonstré in the diocese of Laon, where they were first established in 1119 by the founder St. Norbert. Their earliest settlement in England was at Newhouse in Lincolnshire about 1143, but their chief house was at Welbeck in Nottinghamshire, founded in 1153. The beautiful ruins of the church at Bayham in Sussex furnish a good specimen of the plan on which the churches of this Order were commonly constructed,—a long narrow nave without aisles; very short transepts, and an apsidal choir. White Canons.

The most severe of all the reformed Benedictine Orders was the Carthusian, founded by St. Bruno in 1084 in the rocky wilderness of Chartreux (near Grenoble), whence the name of the Order. Their rule was intensely austere: their garments were to be of the coarsest material, goatskin being worn next the flesh, all meat was forbidden, and on one day in each week their fare consisted of bread, salt, and water only. Fish and cheese were the utmost luxuries permitted, even on high festivals, and the scanty measure of wine allowed by the Benedictine rule was always to be mixed with water. Each brother occupied a separate cell, and the only exemption from strict silence was on Sundays and festivals when they met in the refectory, or in connection with some joint labour, such as the transcription and binding of books. In their churches no processions were permitted, and all ornaments were excluded, except one silver chalice, and a silver tube through which the sacramental element was taken. The number of Carthusian houses in England never exceeded eleven. Their paucity, as compared with other Orders, may have been owing to the fact that, like the Cluniac houses, they were all alien priories dependent on the parent house. The earliest in England was established by Henry II. in 1180 at Witham in Somerset, and had the honour of receiving for its first prior the saintly Hugh of Avalon. Hinton in Somerset was founded in 1223 by William Longspée, Earl of Salisbury. All the other houses, including the Charterhouse in London and Shene in Surrey, the largest and wealthiest, belong to a later period than that with which we are dealing.

The Carthusians.

There were of course some differences of detail in the constitution and daily life of the several monastic houses, even of those which belonged to the same Order, but the following sketch may be regarded as fairly descriptive of a large class of houses, both for monks and canons regular. The monasteries presented, in a rude and turbulent age, patterns of well-ordered industrious communities, and furnished quiet homes where men who were weary of the world, or constitutionally unfitted for its rough ways, might live in security and die in peace. A large convent was in fact a little Christian commonwealth. The

A monastic staff. The prior.

Abbot, or the Prior if the Bishop was Abbot, was head of the whole community both in spiritual and secular affairs. In his temporal aspect, if the estates of the house were large, he was a great feudal lord. When he went on progress he was accompanied by a grand retinue, and the more worldly abbots did not scruple to keep horses and hounds and indulge in the pleasure of hunting. At the monastery he commonly had a separate dwelling,[1] with a large hall in which he entertained distinguished guests on great occasions with sumptuous hospitality. In the church he occupied the chief place, and said certain services or parts of services that were assigned to him. He administered extreme unction to dying brethren, and celebrated the mass for the dead. He was, of course, the president of the daily chapter, where he assessed the penalties for misdemeanours, and he was the ultimate arbiter in all disputes; although he might confer with the most discreet and devout of the brethren as his assessors. He was responsible for the general discipline of the whole house, and was always to be treated with the greatest deference and respect. All who passed him, or whom he passed were to bow reverently to him. No one might leave the precincts without his permission.

The Abbot was assisted in his duties by the Prior, who was the disciplinary officer of the house. It was his special business to go round the whole house and infirmary after the last evening service called compline, to take the keys to the dormitory, and there remain until he woke the brethren for the midnight service, called lauds.

The sub-prior.

The Precentor, with his subordinate the Succentor, was responsible for the due performance of all the services, leading the singing, and marking down on the notice-board those who were to take part in each service. He had also to see that the service books were in good order, clean, well-bound, and clearly written. In some cases he had also the custody of the general library. Books were in most instances originally kept in a recess, called the armarium, in the cloister, where also all reading and writing

The precentor.

[1] Although the council of Westminster, 1102, forbade this except in cases of necessity. See above, p. 121.

went on, the latter in a part assigned for the purpose called the scriptorium. As the number of books increased a separate library and scriptorium were generally built, apart from the cloister but adjacent to it—most commonly over the slype or passage between the chapter-house and the south transept.

"Obedientiaries."

The principal officials of the community, known by the name of "obedientiaries," were the Sacrist and Sub-sacrist, who had charge of all the vessels and furniture of the church, and commonly lodged inside the walls; the Treasurer, the Receiver of the rents, the Hordarian, a kind of steward who purchased the supplies of bread, fish, meat, and beer, which were handed on to the kitchener by the Refectorian or Fraterer, who had charge of the refectory.

The business of the Cellarer was by no means confined to such functions as his name would naturally imply. He was a high official, ranking in some instances next to the precentor. In the constitutions of Lanfranc he is described as being a kind of father to the whole community, looking after the sick and the whole. With his assistant the sub-cellarer he saw to the repairs of the offices, and kept accounts, being in fact a kind of bursar. He also attended to visitors, though this duty was sometimes entrusted to a distinct official called the Hosteller or Hospitarius.

The Chamberlain had to see that the garments of the brethren were properly made, mended, and washed. The Infirmarer had the oversight of the sick-house, the Almoner was responsible for the distribution of alms, which consisted mainly of broken victuals, and clothes. The Lignar was responsible for the supply of fuel, the Gardener and Pittancer had charge of the gardens and fishponds.

Most of these various officials had little estates assigned to their offices, from the revenues of which they had to provide the several materials or implements required for their duties. The accounts of their expenses, which they presented for audit at stated times, were kept (as we know from the many specimens which have been preserved) with the greatest nicety and precision, the cost of every item being set down to the fraction of a farthing.

Besides the "obedientaries" there were attached to the greater monasteries, especially the Cistercian, large numbers of workmen and craftsmen, agricultural labourers, smiths, carpenters, masons, shoemakers, tailors, metal-workers, for almost everything required for food, clothing, building, or repairs in the monastery was home made. These workmen and artisans, called "conversi," had quarters of their own, in which they lodged and plied their various tasks and crafts. A noble specimen of a "domus conversorum" (*house of conversi*) may be seen at Fountains Abbey, consisting of a long and spacious vaulted chamber or hall adjacent to the cloister.

The conversi.

The primary object of a monk's life was devotion, and seven times in the course of each day between midnight and nine in the evening or thereabouts, the hours of prayer had to be observed. At midnight the brethren were roused by the dormitory bell, and proceeded by lantern light to the church to say mattins and lauds. At daybreak their brief slumbers were again broken for prime. After prime the morning mass was generally celebrated, and then followed the daily meeting in the chapter-house, where misdemeanours were inquired into, the lists of persons responsible for various duties was read, and the general business of the house discussed. After chapter came the service called terce, which was succeeded by high mass, and this again by sext. After sext there might be an interval for reading, and then came dinner, the first meal in the day, for which the brethren assembled in the refectory. Silence was kept, while an official called the "Reader at Table" read aloud some instructive or devotional book from a stone lectern or pulpit, examples of which, some of them very beautiful, may be seen in the remains of monastic buildings, as at Beaulieu in Hampshire, where the old refectory has been converted into the parish church.

The daily devotions.

The intervals between dinner and none, and none and evensong were filled up in various ways, partly sleep, partly study, or manual labour and recreation. Supper followed evensong, and after supper there was a reading called collation, sometimes followed by a draught of beer in the refectory, whence the word collation came to signify light refreshment.

The evening ended with the service of compline, which being concluded, the brethren all retired to rest in the dormitory until the midnight bell for mattins and lauds summoned them to begin the round again.

The bare record of this customary routine suggests a life of severe monotony, which we are apt to imagine must have become wearisome to many, if not intolerable. It may have been so in some instances, but probably not in many. For the majority of monks in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were either men of deep and genuine devotion, or so weary of the world that security and peace were all they asked for. And, moreover, the monk's life, especially in a large house, was by no means devoid of its excitements and diversions. Some of the brethren accompanied the abbot when he went on progress to visit the estates; the condition of the lands, the buildings, and the tenants would supply interesting topics for discussion on their return. The travellers whom they entertained at the monastery brought news and gossip from various parts of the world. Then there were often exciting disputes, or lawsuits, either with the bishop about his right of visitation, or with the burghers of the town which had grown up round the monastery about tolls, dues, and rights claimed by the monastery as the original owner of the ground on which the town was built. These disputes frequently involved journeys of some of the brethren to Rome. There was the daily interest of the chapter-meeting, with its disclosures of peccadillos or worse offences, for which penances had to be inflicted, perhaps a flogging administered. Often there was the interest of watching the progress of some addition to the church or the conventual buildings, or the elaboration of some fine piece of carving, or metal-work, or book-illuminating. The cultivation of the gardens was a healthful recreation, and the game of bowls was in some houses an allowable pastime. The periodical bleeding also, which was for centuries a regular practice considered essential to health, was a delightful time of relaxation to the monk; then, for a few days, he was exempted from the daily services in the church, he was allowed various comforts and food not permitted at other times, and more freedom of conversation with his brethren.

Variety of interests and occupations.

There were two religious Orders which owed their origin to the Crusading movement. The "Knights Hospitallers," instituted in 1092, ministered to the needs of pilgrims who were disabled by illness, or rendered destitute by the expenses of their journey, or by robbery on the way. Knights Hospitallers and Templars.

The "Knights Templars," so called because their earliest abode was in rooms near the Temple at Jerusalem, were founded in 1118 to guard the roads traversed by pilgrims. Both Orders were for many years held in such esteem and reverence that they received rich gifts of lands from royal and noble benefactors in all parts of Christendom. In England the chief house of the Knights Hospitallers was established in 1100 near Clerkenwell. The first house of the Templars was somewhere in Holborn, whence it was transferred in 1185 to the New Temple, as it was called, in Fleet Street, where the church still abides, a beautiful and interesting specimen of the architecture of the period. Both Orders had small houses, commanderies or preceptories, as they were called, on their estates, which were scattered over England. The rule adopted by these two Orders, so far as it was compatible with their military duties, was that of the Austin Canons. The Knights Hospitallers, or of St. John of Jerusalem, wore a black habit with a white cross upon the left shoulder; the Templars wore a white habit with a red cross. Both these Orders in their best days did noble military service.

Hospitals of various kinds, some being of the nature of inns for pilgrims and travellers, others asylums for the aged and impotent, others infirmaries for the sick, were established during this period in such abundance in all parts of the country that it would be impossible to enumerate or describe a quarter of them within the limits of this work. Perhaps none has survived with so little change to the present day as the Hospital of St. Cross, the noble foundation of the great Bishop of Winchester, Henry of Blois, established in the green meadow beside the clear stream of the swift-flowing Itchen, a mile south of Winchester, to be the home in perpetuity of thirteen poor men, too aged and feeble to work. The original charter was granted in 1136, and still the thirteen bedesmen worship daily in the stately church Hospitals.

which, in its main substance, abides as it was built in the time of Bishop Henry; still they wear the old black cloak significant of the rule of St. Austin, adorned on the breast with the silver *croix pattée* dating from the days when the hospital was placed by the founder under the care of the Knights Hospitallers. All hospitals in these times were more or less of the nature of religious houses. The foundation, however small, always included a church or chapel for the inmates, and the whole institution was generally placed under the management of a master or prior, with a few chaplains or canons, who lived in accordance with some rule, most frequently that of the Augustinians, or some modification of it.

Even such a slight survey as it has been possible to give here of the religious Orders established in England in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries may help the reader to form an adequate idea of their influence and power. They were large landowners, and this was in many ways a benefit to the people. The monks were continually resident, whereas the bishops and many of the lay proprietors were frequently called away from their estates on public affairs, and so hindered from looking closely after the welfare of their tenants. In districts where the towns were rare and small, the monastic houses must have been inestimable boons, not only to the traveller, who could obtain food and shelter there, but to the resident poor in the neighbourhood. The condition of the people in many a secluded village or hamlet would have been wretched and barbarous in the extreme but for some monastic house which had the means of remunerating labour and relieving distress. And although there were disadvantages in the appropriation of parish churches to monastic communities, their vicars being often underpaid and only occasional visitors, until the bishops insisted upon residence and an adequate stipend; yet on the other hand the secular priest living in solitude on a remote country benefice had more temptations to sink into ignorance and indolence, if not vice, than the member of a brotherhood, who was responsible to it for the discharge of his trust, and might from time to time be refreshed by a visit to the monastic house, or by visitors from it.

Beneficial influence of monasteries.

AUTHORITIES.—Dugdale's *Monasticon;* "Decreta pro ordine Sti. Benedicti," in Lanfranc's *Works*, ed. Giles; *Chronicle of Battle Abbey;* Freeman's *Norm. Conq.*, vol. iv. p. 408 *seq.* On the early history of Lewes Priory see a careful paper derived from original documents, some of which are not in Dugdale, by W. H. Blaauw, in vol. ii. of the *Sussex Archæolog. Journal; Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne*, by Ph. Guignard, Dijon, 1878, containing the "Rule of St. Benedict," the "Origin of the Cistercian Order" ("Exordium Cisterciensis Cenobii"), and the "Customs" ("Consuetudines"); "Life of St. Stephen Harding," in *Lives of Saints*, ed. J. H. Newman, *Obedientiary Rolls of St. Swithun's, Winchester*, ed. Dean Kitchin (Hants Record Society); *Accounts of the "Obedientiars" of Abingdon Abbey* (Camden Society); *Annales Monastici*, esp. Waverley, Margan and Meaux (Rolls series); *Memorials of Fountains Abbey*, 2 vols., ed. J. R. Walbran (Surtees Society); *Customs of St. Giles Priory, Barnwell*, ed. J. W. Clark, M.A., Cambridge; *Magna Vita Sti. Hugonis* (Rolls series); Bp. Stubbs's Preface to *Epist. Cantuarienses* (Rolls series); "The Settlement of the Cistercians in England," Miss A. M. Cooke; *The Historical Review*, October 1893; Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, ed. Gasquet, vols. v. and i. Introduction.

CHAPTER XV

BISHOPS, CLERGY, FRIARS

THE relation of bishops to the people could not be so close for some time after the Norman Conquest as it had been before that event. The Norman bishop could hardly be the spiritual father of his flock in the same degree as his English predecessor; not only because he was a foreigner, but also because he was a great baron of the realm, subject to feudal obligations, often absent from his diocese in attendance on the king, or employed on the business of the State. And when he was in his diocese he resided less in his country manor-houses than in some strong castle, within or hard by the fortified city of his see, especially after the removal of sees from villages to towns. It is significant of the altered relation that after the Norman Conquest the tribal designation of the bishop is dropped. He is no longer called after the name of the people,—bishop of the West Saxons, South Saxons, Sumorsetan, or the like, but by the name of the city in which his see was fixed.

Norman bishops.

On the other hand, the moral and intellectual standard of the Norman bishops, speaking generally, was higher than that of their English predecessors.[1] William was careful and conscientious in his appointments. Lanfranc was of course an exceptional man, combining in a rare degree legal and scholastic learning with consummate practical wisdom and strict integrity. But many of the other prelates appointed in the reign of the Conqueror were men of great ability and learning, and all were, to say the least, of respectable character.

[1] On the character of English bishops in the first half of the eleventh century, see vol. i. pp. 390, 391.

Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, 1070-1098, a kinsman of the king, was a learned and devout man, and in the end won the affection of his monastic chapter, which had resented his appointment partly because he was a foreigner, and partly because, being a secular clerk, he wished to substitute canons for monks.

Osbert, or Osbern, Bishop of Exeter, 1072-1103, is described by William of Malmesbury as liberal in mind and chaste in life.

Osmund, Bishop of Sarum, 1078-1099, a nephew of the Conqueror, was pre-eminent for his purity of life and freedom from ambition. He was employed by the king on the preparation of Domesday Book, but his principal achievements were the organisation and endowment of his chapter with a dean, precentor, chancellor, treasurer, and thirty-two prebendaries, and the compilation of an ordinal and consuetudinary, which became a model largely adopted in other dioceses besides his own. He was diligent also in collecting books for the cathedral library, and did not disdain to take part in the work of binding and transcribing with his own hands.

Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, 1077-1108, was the first of several Norman bishops of English sees who were trained in the famous monastery of Bec. The friend of Lanfranc, he was taken by him first to Caen and then to England. He was a man after Lanfranc's own heart, for to deep personal piety of the monastic type he joined great capacity for practical business, which he proved by a skilful administration of the archiepiscopal estates for Lanfranc, and by the reorganisation of his own chapter and the rebuilding of his cathedral at Rochester. He also built the White Tower at London for the Conqueror, and a castle at Rochester for William Rufus. Yet his secular occupations never hindered him from the due discharge of his spiritual duties. He always celebrated mass twice daily when he was at Rochester; he had the courage to rebuke William Rufus for his iniquities, and he alone amongst the bishops adhered firmly to his friend St. Anselm throughout his contest with the Red King.

Thomas of Bayeux, Archbishop of York, 1070-1100, was an accomplished scholar, who had studied in France, Germany, and Spain. He was specially learned in philosophy and

skilled in music, for he knew how to make organs as well as how to play on them. Like Osmund of Sarum, he completely organised his chapter, rebuilt, or almost rebuilt, his cathedral, which had been ruined in the terrible suppression of the rebellion in 1069, and provided it with books and ornaments. His strife with Lanfranc and Anselm about his metropolitan rights, although persistent, was carried on without bitterness.[1]

Walcher, Bishop of Durham, 1071-1080, was weak and unwise in the temporal government of the earldom conferred upon him after the revolt of Waltheof, and he paid the penalty in a violent death;[2] but he was vigorous in the reform of his chapter, and is described as being learned, pure in morals, and gentle in temper.

The least satisfactory of the prelates appointed in the reign of the Conqueror seems to have been Herfast, Bishop of the East Anglian see of Elmham (afterwards moved to Thetford). Like Stigand, who was made Bishop of Selsey in place of the deposed Englishman, Æthelric, he was a royal clerk or chaplain. The custom of elevating royal chaplains to bishoprics became increasingly common in the reigns of William's sons, and the highest type of prelate was rarely formed out of these officials. Life at court, where they were much engaged in secretarial work, tended to make them clever men of business, but too often lowered their moral tone.

From the close of the Conqueror's reign throughout the period with which we are concerned the bishops may be divided into three main types. One consists of those who were pre-eminent in personal holiness; another of men who served as ministers of State, holding the high offices of chancellor, justiciar, or treasurer, or were actively employed as ambassadors and diplomatists; a third class was composed of men less secular and political, who made the interests of the Church their foremost aim, men for the most part of learning and culture, active and conscientious administrators of their dioceses, and of high character, though not rising to the level of actual saintliness.

Three types of bishops.

Anselm, if he is to be put into any class at all, belongs, of course, to the first of these three; yet he can scarcely be co-

[1] See above, pp. 29-33. [2] See above, p. 41.

ordinated with other men, but stands out as an almost unique personality in the exceeding loftiness and purity of his character, combined with profundity and originality of thought as a philosopher and theologian.

i. Saints.

St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln; St. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury; and his friend St. Richard of Wyche, Bishop of Chichester, were all fine examples of the mediæval type of saint, severely ascetic, profuse in almsgiving, indifferent to worldly honour, fearless in reproving wickedness and wrong-doing in high places, happiest in seclusion, study, and devotion.

The second class, composed of bishops more or less secular in tone, was a very large one, containing some very good and a few very bad men, but many more who were mixed characters, of various degrees of merit and ability, and employed in very various capacities. Amongst the worst must be placed Ralph Flambard, Bishop of Durham, the evil counsellor of William Rufus, and Hugh of Nonant, Bishop of Lichfield, 1188-1198, a clever, eloquent, unprincipled diplomatist, the chief adviser of John before he came to the throne. Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, 1205-1238, the supporter alike of John and Henry III. in their worst acts of oppression, was a hard unscrupulous man; yet he must not be placed quite so low in the moral scale as the two former prelates. He founded several monastic houses, and left his bishopric in good condition.

ii. State officials, good and bad.

Amongst the very best men in this class, morally and intellectually, were the Archbishops of Canterbury, Hubert Walter and Stephen Langton, able, upright, patriotic men, rising to a high level of statesmanship, leaders of the nation in difficult critical times. With Stephen Langton was associated Ralph Neville, chancellor of the realm and Bishop of Chichester, 1224-1244; "faithful," says Matthew Paris, "in many perils, and a singular pillar of truth in the affairs of the kingdom."

Between the two extremes of very good and bad men is a large number of prelates occupying various official positions in the State. Foremost amongst them must be placed the great ministers of the reign of Henry I. Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, 1107-1139, chancellor, justiciar, the reorganiser of the treasury, was second only to the king in power,

earning the title of "the sword of righteousness," as his master was called "the lion of justice." Nigel, his nephew, Bishop of Ely, was treasurer, and his son, Richard Fitz-Nigel, or Fitz-Neal, author of the famous treatise on the work of the exchequer known as *Dialogus de Scaccario*, was made treasurer in succession to his father in 1169, justice itinerant in 1179, Dean of Lincoln 1184, and finally Bishop of London in 1188. The excellence of his financial administration was proved by the large balance in the treasury, amounting to 100,000 marks, at the close of the reign of Henry II., notwithstanding the costly wars in which the king had been engaged.

Richard of Ilchester, Bishop of Winchester, 1174-1188, was a more accomplished man, and stands on a higher level of character and statesmanship than Roger of Salisbury and his family. From being a clerk in the king's court (*scriptor curiæ*) and in the royal chancery under Thomas Becket, he was promoted to be Archdeacon of Poitiers. As a baron of exchequer, he shewed extraordinary aptitude for financial business; he was a justice itinerant in eleven counties, custodian of the sees of Lincoln and Winchester during vacancy, and of the Abbey of Glastonbury, and finally Bishop of Winchester in 1174. Although he supported the king in his contest with Becket, publishing the obnoxious "Customs" after the council of Clarendon, in his archdeaconry of Poitiers, and acting as ambassador to the Emperor Frederick on behalf of Henry's interests, he did not forfeit the esteem of Becket's friend, John of Salisbury, or of Ralph de Diceto, the learned Dean of St. Paul's. He was for eighteen months, Michælmas 1176 to March 1178, Justiciar of Normandy, and had the whole administration of the duchy in his hands, and after his return to England he became in 1179 one of three justiciars for England, and chief of the itinerant justices for the southern circuit. Yet amidst these multifarious secular employments he was not unmindful of his duty to his diocese He erected many churches, was liberal in almsgiving, and doubled the number of poor men who received food daily at the Hospital of St. Cross, while he retrenched the fare of the monks in the cathedral monastery so severely that they made a formal complaint to the king, Henry II. The king, however, sup-

ported him in his reforms, and the annalist of the monastery, in recording his death, speaks of "Bishop Richard of good memory having departed to the Lord," so we may infer that the monks had become reconciled to him, and learned to recognise his merits.

Amongst bishops of the secular type one of the most conspicuous figures in the reign of Henry II. and Richard I. is Hugh de Puiset, Bishop of Durham, 1153-1197, sometime Earl of Northumberland, and sheriff of the county, and also one of three justiciars of the realm. He was a great-grandson of the Conqueror, and a nephew of King Stephen, and his outward appearance and demeanour were worthy of his noble birth and grand position. Of commanding stature, handsome countenance, eloquent speech, attractive manner, whatever he did was on a grand scale. He was a great builder, a great hunter, a great shipowner, living in sumptuous style, and altogether in power and magnificence resembling more nearly than any other English prelate some of the ecclesiastical princes of Germany. As a politician he was ambitious, intriguing, and cautious; yet hardly a match for his astute rival, William Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, the favourite minister of Richard I., although far superior to him in all the outward advantages of rank, wealth, and personal appearance.

iii. Ecclesiastics. Henry of Blois.

Turning now to bishops of the third type who were ecclesiastics rather than statesmen, a high place must be assigned to Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester for forty-one years, 1129-1171, and Abbot of Glastonbury for forty-five, 1126-1171. He was almost as magnificent a personage as his nephew, Hugh de Puiset, but much less secular in tone and aims. His ambition was directed to the acquisition of ecclesiastical rather than political power. He was disappointed in his hope of obtaining the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1136, and defeated in his subsequent project of making his own see metropolitan with six suffragans to be taken out of the province of Canterbury, but he was made papal legate in 1139, and in that capacity, as long as it lasted, enjoyed a position of pre-eminent power and importance. He found abundant scope for his energies in a vigorous rule of his abbey and his diocese, and in grand architectural works. At Glastonbury he built the bell tower

of the church, the refectory, and the cloister, a palace and a gateway; on his episcopal estates he erected three palaces, or rather castles, Wolvesey at Winchester, Farnham, and Waltham. The brotherhood of St. Cross and the grand church of the hospital are noble and abiding monuments of his charity and munificence. His political fluctuations in the distracted reign of Stephen have been recorded in a previous chapter. In the strife between Henry II. and Thomas Becket he endeavoured to mediate, and was never a warm partisan of either side. In his old age he was fond of sojourning at the Abbey of Cluny, of which he was a liberal benefactor, and indulged his taste in collecting works of art. Amongst these we may probably include the great square font in Winchester Cathedral, with its richly carved reliefs representing scenes in the life of St. Nicholas of Myra.

More devoid of secularity, more learned, and less ambitious, was Archbishop Theobald. Quiet, unpretending, scholarly, he loved the society of able and learned men whom he gathered round him, and partly trained up in his house. He held no secular office, and was no political partisan, but commanding, as he did, general respect by reason of his uprightness and sagacity he did the best possible service to the State in arranging terms of peace between Stephen and Henry, and by maintaining good order in England during the interval between the death of Stephen and the arrival of Henry II.

Abp. Theobald.

Last, but by no means least, amongst the bishops of this school must be reckoned Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford, 1148-1163, and of London, 1163-1187. No man of his time had a higher reputation for learning, ability, and sanctity of life. He had been a monk of Cluny, and had risen to be prior of that great house, whence he was promoted to be head of the dependent priory of Abbeville. In 1139 he was made Abbot of St. Peter's, Gloucester, through the influence of his kinsman, Miles the Constable, lord of Gloucester Castle, and sheriff of the county. In this post, which he occupied for nine years, he justified his reputation for personal holiness of an ascetic type, and proved himself a vigorous ruler of the house. Attaching himself to no particular party, but working for the general good of the

Gilbert Foliot.

church and nation, he became the confidential adviser of nearly all the bishops, including Archbishop Theobald and the papal legate, Henry of Winchester. In 1148 he was made Bishop of Hereford, and in 1163 was translated to London by the desire of the king, which was strongly supported or prompted by Archbishop Thomas, although Gilbert had opposed his election to the primacy the year before.

Thomas, we may believe, expected to find in him a valuable ally in defending the rights of the Church, and in directing the mind of the king. In principle Gilbert probably agreed with the archbishop on the question of clerical privileges, but to his acute, comprehensive mind, and cold, cautious, sarcastic temperament, the impulsive vehemence of Thomas was offensive, as being likely to defeat the end in view, and perilous to higher interests of the Church and nation than those for which Thomas was contending. For after all, as he remarks in one of his letters, no vital question of doctrine, or even of Church discipline, was at stake. The "customs," however objectionable in themselves, having once been accepted, it was the part of wise men to make the best and not the worst of them, and to wait for an opportunity of getting them modified or cancelled by peaceful and conciliatory methods. His contempt for Becket's ill-advised and blundering action found expression at the memorable scene in the council of Northampton, when he exclaimed, "A fool thou always wast, and always wilt be."[1] He always denied that he had ever entertained any ambition to obtain the archbishopric of Canterbury. It is impossible to forbear thinking that had he been appointed to it, everything of real importance for which Thomas struggled so boldly and fiercely might have been obtained, probably without strife and suffering, certainly without bloodshed.

Archbishop Thomas Becket belonged in turn to the three schools or types which we have been considering—the secular, the ecclesiastical, the saintly. By nature he was undoubtedly fitted for the first. In his lofty stature, his majestic presence, and the magnificence with which he surrounded himself, he was the equal of Hugh de Puiset; in charm of manner to his friends, and power of

Archbishop Thomas.

[1] See above, p. 172.

winning their affection and devotion, he was undoubtedly superior to him, as well as in his strict personal morality. In his capacity of chancellor he proved himself an able, upright minister of State. After his elevation to the archbishopric he felt that he must lay aside all secularity and become the thorough-going ecclesiastic. He threw himself into the part of a champion of the Church's rights with an intensity and vehemence in which there is something strained and almost artificial. And although he practised great asceticism, the general tone of his conduct and utterances was far from saint-like. His terrible death, which was met with fortitude, and was the consequence of his inflexible adherence to principles for which he had long been striving, procured him enormous veneration, yet it was in fact the penalty, however unjustifiable, of lamentable want of judgment and tact, and of a long course of fierce and headstrong conduct which cannot be justified.

Robert Grosseteste.

Of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1235-1253, it will be necessary to speak more particularly in connection with the subjects of diocesan administration, and of the learning of the day. He cannot be co-ordinated with other prelates in any of the three classes or schools already mentioned; for he stands out by himself an almost unique character, a kind of intellectual giant, a scholar of extraordinary range of knowledge, being almost equally distinguished in theology, philosophy, mathematics, and physics. He was a wise and vigorous ruler of his diocese, a reformer of abuses in the Church, who feared the wrath neither of king nor pope, and a patriotic citizen who supplied Simon de Montfort and the leaders of reform in the State with sound principles of action. Nor was there any prelate who more thoroughly deserved the title of saint, although formal canonisation was denied him through some sinister influence at Rome.

Each of the three types of bishops which we have been considering had its value and force in the development of the national life. The employment of the highest spiritual order in secular offices of State was attended by some obvious evils; but, on the other hand, it was an advantage to the State that the chief administration should be in the hands of men who were generally superior to laymen in learning and culture, and in their conceptions and methods of government. Again, the

efforts of the more purely ecclesiastical type to vindicate the rights of the clergy helped to teach and train other classes of the community how to fight for their liberties against arbitrary power when the time came.

Prior to the Norman Conquest there had been no rigid rule respecting the method of electing to bishoprics, mainly owing to the close connection and concord between the temporal and ecclesiastical powers. The election was sometimes made by the chapter of the cathedral church, and afterwards confirmed by the king and the witenagemot; more commonly a nomination was made by the king which the witenagemot confirmed. This indeed became the almost invariable practice in the eleventh century. William the Conqueror observed the old form of nominating at a meeting of the great council, although no one could have dared to oppose his appointment, however it might have been made. One of the results of the struggle between Henry I. and Anselm on the question of investiture was to grant the rights of election to the cathedral chapters; but as the election had to be made in a national council, or in one of the royal chapels and in the presence of the justiciar of the realm, it was difficult to reject any one whom the king recommended. John gave the chapters the rights of free election, subject to the royal license and approval, neither of which was to be withheld without just cause. He hoped by conceding this privilege to bribe the clergy into supporting his cause against the barons, a hope in which he was disappointed. Although the right of the chapters to elect remained nominally free, the kings as a matter of fact exercised a great deal of influence on elections. They often had a party in the chapter, and tried to force their candidate into the see. Hence arose suspicions of simony; the archbishop might intervene and refuse to confirm or consecrate, and the result would be an appeal to Rome from one side or from both. The attempts of Henry III. to influence the chapters were undignified and generally unsuccessful; his nominees were rarely accepted, and the pope consequently reaped a plentiful harvest of appeals. Between 1216 and 1264 as many as thirty cases of disputed elections were carried to Rome for decision.

Modes of election to bishoprics.

Papal interference. i. Appeals.

The practice of translating bishops from one see to another, which began in the thirteenth century, and increased after the reign of Edward I., afforded another opportunity for papal interference. The theory was that a bishop being wedded to his see, only the pope could grant a divorce, and that when he had granted it by authorising the translation, it was his duty and privilege to console the widowed see by filling up the vacancy.

ii Translations.

With the appointments to suffragan sees the popes did not exercise much interference before the thirteenth century, but over the appointment of metropolitans they had always exercised some control, even prior to the Norman Conquest, by the gift of the pall or *pallium*. Originally presented by the pope to the newly-appointed metropolitan, merely as a compliment, it had come to be regarded as an emblem of metropolitan authority, so that until he had received it a primate did not venture to consecrate other bishops. The reception of it was the occasion of a grand ceremony, in which the archbishop swore obedience to the pope. In the election of the Archbishops of Canterbury the bishops of the province claimed some voice, concurrently with the chapter of Christchurch, but they failed to establish their claim permanently; and ultimately the appointment rested with the three powers—the sovereign who nominated or recommended, the chapter who elected, the pope who decided on appeal, or could nullify the election by withholding the pall if he considered the candidate unworthy.

iii. Elections.

It is to be noted that during the period with which we are concerned, the several steps in the process of making a bishop were commonly in the reverse order to that which has prevailed in modern times. Then the order was homage, consecration, enthronement; now it is consecration, enthronement, homage. This difference is to be explained by the difference in the point of view from which the episcopate has been regarded in mediæval and in modern times. In feudal ages it was looked at primarily as a fief chargeable with certain spiritual duties; in later ages it has been looked at primarily as a spiritual office, to which certain temporal possessions are attached. In the one case the office

The order of making bishops.

was treated as an appendage to the benefice, in the other the benefice is treated as an appendage to the office.

Geoffrey, natural son of Henry II., having been elected to the see of Lincoln in 1175, received the revenues, administered the temporal affairs of the diocese, and appointed to canonries for six years without having even been ordained to the priesthood. He was afterwards nominated to the archbishopric of York in July 1189, but he was not consecrated till August 18, 1191, yet in the interval he had spent some time at York, and had excommunicated the precentor and treasurer for insubordination.

As the popes interfered more and more with the election of bishops, so by means of the legatine office they interfered with the exercise of archiepiscopal authority. Before the Norman Conquest there were no visits of legates, properly so-called, to England. William the Conqueror invited three legates in 1070, who assisted him in the deposition of the native bishops and abbots,[1] but he laid down the rule that no legate should be admitted in England unless he had been invited by the king and the Church. The introduction of a legate without such permission was regarded as an infringement of the rights of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Anselm remonstrated with Pope Pascal II. on this ground for sending the Archbishop of Vienne as his legate to England, and when John of Crema held a legatine council in London in 1125, it was resented as an insult. Archbishop William of Corbeil went to Rome immediately after the legate's visit, and obtained a commission for himself to act as legate with jurisdiction over the whole of Britain, and it gradually became a fixed custom for the Archbishops of Canterbury to receive the legatine commission as soon as their election was confirmed at Rome. The hold of the papacy upon the Church was strengthened by this practice, while it seemed to enhance the dignity of the primate, and strengthen his hands in any strife that might arise between him and the sovereign. The archbishops were called *legati nati* (native legates) of the apostolic see, a title which was given to them in all formal documents. Special legates, however, *legates a latere* as they were called, were sent

Papal legates.

[1] See above, pp. 13, 14.

from time to time direct from the pope and, acting as his representatives superseded the authority of the resident legate. Gualo was a *legate a latere* sent at the beginning of the reign of Henry III., and during the first years of the king's minority was really the chief ruler in State and Church. Cardinal Otho was sent in 1238 to investigate and reform corruptions in the Church. Cardinal Guy Foulquois was appointed on the invitation of Henry III. to assist him in opposing the party of national reformers, and their leader Simon de Montfort.

Cathedral chapters.

The relations of bishops to their cathedral chapters depended partly, of course, upon individual character, but largely also, if not mainly, upon the constitutions of the chapters. They were of two kinds: some cathedrals were served by secular canons, clergy, that is, who had not taken monastic vows; others were served by monks. In the final settlement after the Norman Conquest the cathedral churches in England were almost equally divided between these two classes. Nine were served by seculars—York, London, Lincoln, Exeter, Lichfield, Hereford, Wells, Salisbury, Chichester. To these must be added the four Welsh cathedrals—St. Davids, Llandaff, Bangor, and St. Asaph, which was founded 1143. Ten were served by monks —Canterbury, Durham, Winchester, Rochester, Worcester, Norwich, Ely (made a cathedral church in 1109), Coventry, which was a twin see with Lichfield, and Bath, which in 1245 became a twin see with Wells. Carlisle being served by Austin canons may be reckoned as belonging to the monastic class.[1]

The bishops and the chapters.

Originally the bishop was the acting head of the chapter, whether it was composed of seculars or regulars. They were his companions and assistants, both in the services of the church and in the administration of the diocese; they had no property distinct from his; the bishop with his monks or canons lived together on the common property of the cathedral church. In monastic

[1] The cathedrals served by seculars are called "Cathedrals of the Old Foundation," because the constitution of their chapters has never undergone any material change. The chapters of the monastic cathedrals, on the other hand, were all refounded in the reign of Henry VIII., a dean and canons being substituted for a prior and monks. Hence they are called "Cathedrals of the New Foundation."

cathedrals the bishop was regarded as the abbot. In the secular cathedrals, even if there was a dean, he acted under the bishop, as the chief officer of the chapter, but was not the head of a distinct corporation. As time went on, however, the connection between the bishops and their chapters became less intimate; there was an increasing disposition in chapters of both kinds to assert their independence of episcopal authority, and the general result was that the bishops lost a great deal of their power in their cathedrals, and at the present day have less control over the cathedral church than over any other church in their diocese. The change was due to a combination of causes. If the bishop of a monastic see was not himself a monk, there was an obvious incongruity in his ruling a chapter of monks. The prior naturally became the leading practical head. Probably for the same reason we find that when monks were placed at Durham by Bishop William of St. Calais, their property was made distinct from that of the bishop.

In chapters composed of seculars this separation of the capitular possessions from the episcopal became universal. The property of these cathedral churches was commonly divided into three portions, one forming the estates of the bishop; another forming the common estates of the chapter; while a third was cut up into prebends, estates allotted to the several dignitaries—dean, precentor, chancellor, treasurer,—and to the canons, as their individual property, the endowment of that particular office or stall which each of them held. Thus the canons as a body became a distinct corporation, and each canon became himself a corporation, independent, to some extent, of the capitular body as well as of the bishop. Added to this the bishop was very frequently absent from his cathedral city on affairs of state or of diocesan business, and consequently the dean, who was permanently resident, almost necessarily became the chief ordinary. The bishop sank from the position of a present living head into that of an external visitor, and even in this capacity his authority was apt to be resisted. Many of the great monastic houses had obtained complete exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, and it was the ambition of cathedral chapters, whether monastic or secular, to acquire similar independence. Grosseteste, after a

prolonged strife with the chapter at Lincoln, succeeded in establishing his right as visitor, and after this the visitatorial rights of bishops in cathedrals served by seculars came to be generally acknowledged; although what those rights comprehended might sometimes be a subject of dispute.

Monks of Christchurch, Canterbury.

The monks of Christchurch, Canterbury, had gradually acquired, from the time of the Norman Conquest, a large measure of independence. During the primacy of Lanfranc, if not before it, their estates were separated from those of the archbishop. Anselm granted them complete and absolute management of their estates, all the oblations of the high altar, of which Lanfranc had retained half, and the Xenia or Easter and Christmas offerings from their manors. And while the convent jealously retained their claim to elect the archbishop as the head of the house, they were so far from yielding him implicit obedience that they were quite ready to repudiate him if his action was not agreeable to their views. As Canterbury was the mother church of England they maintained that the profession of obedience, made by the suffragan bishops on their consecration, was rather to the convent than to the archbishop. The influx of wealth, after the martyrdom of St. Thomas, from the crowds of pilgrims who visited the shrine, was enormous, and the style of living became sumptuous. Seventeen dishes were served at the prior's table, and the community of one hundred and forty brethren, with all their dependents, constituted a small town, over which he ruled with absolute authority.

Their strife with Abp. Baldwin.

The relation of the archbishop to the monastery was brought to an acute crisis in the primacy of Baldwin, 1185-1193. To the archbishop, a devout and learned man, trained under the strict Cistercian rule, the indifference shown by the monks to his authority, and their luxurious secular mode of living, were equally offensive. Moreover, in a monastic cathedral he was unable to provide for the clerks and scholars employed in his service, and it was vexatious to him and to them to see the rich revenues of the monastery expended upon lavish hospitality and worldly magnificence, rather than in the promotion of learning and the maintenance of learned men. He therefore determined to set apart a portion of the archiepiscopal pro-

perty, freeing it from various dues hitherto paid to the convent, for the foundation of a collegiate church of secular priests at Hakington, a suburb of Canterbury, to be dedicated to the martyrs Stephen and Thomas. The monks suspected in this project a design to supplant the cathedral church with all its privileges, especially that of electing the archbishops. The result was a protracted and obstinate strife. The convent appealed to Rome. The pope Urban III. favoured the side of the monks; the king and the justiciar, Ralph Glanville, supported the archbishop. All Europe became interested in the struggle and was divided into two factions, actuated partly by political motives, partly by personal or religious sympathies. Philip of France and Philip of Flanders took the side of the convent; Henry the Lion, being the king's son-in-law, favoured the archbishop, and so did the King and Queen of Sicily. The Cistercians, both in England and on the continent, supported the archbishop who belonged to their Order. The Cluniacs, on the other hand, and most of the Benedictine houses, were on the side of the convent. The English bishops, with a few exceptions, stood by the primate.

It would be impossible, within the limits of this work, to follow the incidents of this weary contest in detail. The correspondence of the prior and convent in connection with it fill a large volume. At length, after repeated visits of envoys from both sides to Rome, after ineffectual attempts of Henry II. to make peace by arbitration, and after the convent had suffered a blockade by the archbishop's men for eighty-four days, a compromise was effected by the king, Richard I., who visited Canterbury on November 27, 1189. Baldwin consented to give up the college at Hakington; but it was declared that, as he had the right to build wherever he pleased, this concession was an act of grace on his part. He soon afterwards obtained by exchange from the convent of Rochester twenty-four acres of land at Lambeth, upon which he began to build another collegiate church. In March 1190 he left England for the Crusade and died at Acre in the following November, but the news of his death did not reach England before March 1191. The building of the church at Lambeth went slowly on. The jealous apprehensions of the convent at Canterbury were again aroused, and, in May 1192, they obtained a papal

mandate addressed to the Bishop of Chichester and the Abbots of Reading and Waltham, ordering them to dissolve the college and to close the church. The strife, however, did not end here.

Archbishop Hubert Walter, the successor of Baldwin, and also his friend and executor, told the monks of Canterbury that he felt bound in honour to complete the work of his predecessor, although he offered to remove the college to Maidstone, and build there on ground belonging to the convent. To this they would not assent, and both parties agreed to appeal to Rome. Innocent III. was highly favourable to the monks. Without waiting for the archbishop's advocate he issued a mandate to him for the demolition of the college within thirty days on pain of suspension; and in the event of his refusal his suffragans were to withdraw their obedience from him. The king, incensed at this invasion of the liberties of the English Church, forbade the primate to obey the mandate, wrote an indignant letter to the pope and cardinals, took the college at Lambeth under his own protection, and ordered his officials to occupy the estates of the chapter of Canterbury. Another appeal followed, but although this time the pope heard both sides and took a month to consider his judgment, it proved to be only a reiteration of his former judgment. The archbishop received it on January 2, 1199, and he no longer delayed obedience; the obnoxious church was levelled to the ground, although the college buildings were left standing. The king retaliated by again seizing the estates of the convent, but on his death, which occurred soon afterwards, the justiciar Geoffrey Fitz-Peter restored them. Once more the aid of Rome was invoked, and Innocent appointed the Bishop of Lincoln (St. Hugh), the Bishop of Ely (Eustace), and the Abbot of St. Edmunds, as delegates to try the case.

And with Abp. Hubert Walter.

The delegates had decided some of the points at issue in favour of the archbishop when their powers were revoked by the pope, who required the contending parties to appear before himself at Rome on St. Martin's Day (November 11, 1200). Meanwhile, however, Archbishop Hubert, who probably did not wish the cause to be carried to Rome, proposed that he and the convent should elect arbitrators, and abide

by their decision. They elected the existing delegates, only substituting Roger, the Dean of Lincoln, for the Bishop, St. Hugh, who was dying. On November 6 they made their award, which was favourable to the monks. The primate might build a small house for Premonstratensian canons on another site at Lambeth, and endow it from archiepiscopal estates, but only to the amount of £100 a year. No consecrations or ordinations were to be celebrated in it, and he was not to build any church for secular canons without the consent of the convent.

The complicated strife, of which the merest outline has here been given, is a singular illustration of the cross-currents of conflicting powers to which the English Church at this period was exposed. The monks insist upon what they call their rights: they get the pope on their side, and try to enforce obedience to his mandate as the supreme authority: the king and the primate employ force and legal artifices to resist them. Appeals to Rome had been forbidden by the Constitutions of Clarendon, but the king had renounced the Constitutions; yet while he opposed the appeals of the monks he himself surreptitiously resorted to them. Henry II. did not venture to prohibit the papal mandates as illegal, but he tried to defeat them by some subtle chicanery. Richard I. prohibited the publication of them, yet those who disobeyed the prohibition were not punished.

Interest of the quarrel.

The spiritual condition of the Church and nation suffered grievously from such conflicts of rival authorities. The disciplinary power of the bishops was paralysed by the practice of appeals to Rome; for an appeal placed the refractory priest or the insubordinate capitular body under the protection of the see of Rome. The fashion and sentiment of the age had heaped wealth on monasteries, while the men who discharged secular offices in the State were rewarded with the richest positions in the Church. On the other hand, the clerks and scholars who served the archbishops in various capacities were ill remunerated. The efforts of the Archbishops, Baldwin and Hubert Walter, to found collegiate churches at Hakington and Lambeth were praiseworthy, though abortive, attempts to remedy this evil. The monasteries continued for many years to accumulate wealth,

Results of such quarrels.

but without a corresponding increase in learning or religious usefulness. Their influence in the affairs of Church and State steadily declined; and the monks of Canterbury exercised from this date a merely nominal voice in the election of the archbishops. With the exception of Simon Langham (1362), Baldwin was the last monk who occupied the chair of St. Augustine, whereas from Lanfranc to Baldwin, a period of a hundred and twenty years, every archbishop of Canterbury had been a monk except two, William of Corbeil, who was a canon regular, and therefore virtually a monk, and Thomas Becket.

Archdeacons.

The most direct link between the bishop and the parochial clergy was the archdeacon,—"the bishop's eye," to assist him in overlooking the clergy and in giving effect to his administration. Before the Norman Conquest one archdeacon had sufficed for each diocese, but the separation of the secular and spiritual courts made by the Conqueror led to a great increase of ecclesiastical litigation, and the larger dioceses, and many of the smaller ones, were broken up into several archdeaconries. The working of the archidiaconal courts down to the middle of the twelfth century was highly unsatisfactory, the law being uncertain, the procedure irregular, the archdeacons very often ignorant and mercenary. The revival of the jurisprudence of Justinian, and the issue of Gratian's Decretum, or Concordance of canon laws, 1151, led to an improvement, both in the nature of the law administered and in the method of procedure. English archdeacons commonly went to Bologna or Paris to study civil and canon law before they took up the duties of their archidiaconal office. They were, in many instances, near kinsmen of the bishops who appointed them, and being often nominated at an early age, residence abroad, especially at Bologna, was apt to be injurious to their moral character. Too many of them got involved in debt, or love intrigues; occasionally they were wounded, or even killed, in brawls with the natives. Hence the question raised by John of Salisbury, which became a favourite subject of discussion in the twelfth century, whether it was possible for an archdeacon to be saved, "an possit archidiaconus salvus esse." Not archdeacons only, but other English clerics who were clever and ambitious

flocked to the foreign universities to study civil or canon law or both, and theologians complained that the character of the clergy was in consequence grievously secularised; that theology took a secondary place in their interest, and that moral duties, instead of being enforced by a reference to the plain teaching of Holy Scripture, were reduced to a legal system of penances and fines, the compulsory attendance at mass, and performance of other religious observances. "Who," said John of Salisbury, "ever rises pricked at the heart from a reading of the laws or even of the canons?"

Parochial clergy.

The English parochial clergy were not systematically ejected after the Norman Conquest, like the bishops and abbots. Nevertheless there was some risk that the native clergy might foment discontent and disaffection amongst their flocks towards their new masters, and it was obviously more convenient for Norman bishops to rule over Norman than over Saxon clerks. Norman landowners in some instances presented their own countrymen to livings on their own estates. At first there was probably but little sympathy in such cases between the priest and his people, but daily contact between them in the intimate and sacred relation of pastor and flock soon softened the sense of estrangement. We know that in less than a hundred years after the Conquest the distinction between Norman and Englishman had vanished, and this fusion of the two races must have been largely due to the influence of their common religion.

Parish churches.

Like the Norman bishops and abbots, many of the Norman lay landowners removed the existing churches on the estates which were allotted to them out of the conquered soil, and built new ones on a larger scale. In many instances they bestowed the advowson of these churches on monasteries which they had founded or to which they were attached, either in England or on the Continent, together with some or all of the tithes and offerings. The church in fact, with its endowments, became the property of the monastic house. In these cases the monks discharged the spiritual duties for which they became responsible, either through some member of their community, or through a stipendiary priest whom they appointed, and

could dismiss at pleasure. But this was an unsatisfactory system; for the stipendiary priest was too often underpaid, and neither he nor the occasional visitor from the monastic house had any permanent interest in the parish. Sometimes also churches were farmed by the monks to clerks for a small rent. Accordingly, at the synod of Westminster held by Anselm in 1102, a canon was passed that parish churches should not be appropriated to monasteries without the consent of the bishop, and that, if appropriated, a sufficient stipend for the officiating clerk should be reserved out of the revenues. A further check to the evil was provided by the decree of the Lateran council in 1179, which empowered bishops to make arrangements for the due pastoral care of appropriate parishes.

Armed with this authority the bishop generally required the monastic house to nominate a clerk to be approved by him, and, if considered satisfactory, to be instituted to the living as perpetual vicar. He was responsible to the bishop for the proper discharge of his duty, and could not be removed without his consent. A house was provided for him, and what was considered a sufficient income, five marks being the minimum permitted, except in Wales. The sources of income varied according to arrangement: in most instances it consisted of the small tithes, that is to say, of all except corn, together with fees and offerings, the great tithe, or corn-tithe, being reserved for the religious house. In some cases the vicar took the whole revenue, and paid a fixed sum to the monastery; in others the monks took the whole of the revenue, and paid a fixed annual stipend to the vicar. The thirteenth century is a period in which the bishops were most actively engaged in establishing vicarages in appropriate parishes, or arranging the terms on which vacancies in them should be filled up. Bishop Grosseteste obtained authority from the pope to deal with exempt monasteries and compel them to have vicarages adequately endowed. The vicars were very commonly relatives of the benefactors of the religious house, or of the abbot or prior, abbess or prioress. If the nomination was delayed more than six months the appointment lapsed to the bishop.

Vicarages.

In addition to the parish churches, numerous chapels were erected both before and after the Norman Conquest to pro-

vide for the spiritual needs of outlying districts or hamlets on large estates. They were founded sometimes by the principal owner of the estate, sometimes by the rector of the mother church, sometimes by the mesne lord or some of the tenants collectively. Many of these chapels gradually acquired the position of parish churches, some endowment being obtained, together with the rights of baptism, marriage, and burial. In other cases the mother church reserved all or most of these rights, and the chaplain was a mere stipendiary of the incumbent; often no doubt poorly and irregularly paid. Walter Gray, Archbishop of York, in 1233 consolidated ten chapelries in the two parishes of Pocklington and Pickering into five vicarages—two and two. Each vicar had charge of two chapels, and was endowed with a sum sufficient to support chaplains at both, while he also paid a small sum annually to the mother church in token of subjection. It was a rule that the people who attended the chapels should repair to the parish church to make their communion on the great festivals, and in like manner all parishes in the diocese sent representatives once a year to worship in the cathedral church.[1] Thus the rights of mother churches were maintained, and the sense of a corporate life was strengthened.

Chapelries.

As the profession of a common faith helped to reconcile and fuse the two races, the conquerors and the conquered, so also it was through the Church that the several classes of society could be drawn together, and the nation become increasingly conscious of unity. "In Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free":—not only could all freely take their part in public worship and share in the sacraments and other means of grace, but no class was excluded from the ranks of the clergy. There was, indeed, naturally a strong aristocratic element in the hierarchy; the founder or benefactor of a monastery would often secure the office of abbot or prior for a son or near kinsman, and in like manner a large landowner would present sons or other

The Church promotes national unity.

[1] They walked in procession with banners, and there were sometimes unseemly scrambles for precedence between rival parishes. The usual day for these visits to the mother church was Mid-Lent Sunday, hence called "Mothering Sunday."

relatives to the churches or chapelries on his estates; but the door was not shut against any class. Villeins could not be ordained, and their children could not be educated for the ministry, without the leave of their lords, but the instances are numerous in which the permission was granted. The mercantile and yeoman class supplied a large number of clergy, especially chaplains and chantry priests, and not a few who rose to be prelates, or even primates. Such amongst the archbishops of Canterbury during this period were Thomas Becket, Richard Baldwin, and Edmund Rich.

Clerical celibacy.

A strict enforcement of clerical celibacy was an essential principle of Church reform as conceived by Hildebrand. Not only was the unmarried state regarded as an indispensable feature of Christian perfection, but if the spiritual power was to rule the world it was deemed necessary that the priesthood should be detached from all secular and family ties. If William the Conqueror and Lanfranc were to discharge their mission as reformers of the English Church, it was obviously necessary for them to deal with this question. The fourth Lateran Council in 1074, under the presidency of Hildebrand, as Pope Gregory VII., had framed a canon absolutely forbidding the marriage of the clergy, pronouncing excommunication on those who refused to put away their wives, and forbidding the laity to attend mass, if celebrated by priests who had not complied with the canon. Marriage had long been customary in the English Church both amongst parish priests and canons of cathedral churches.[1] A tendency to hereditary succession in ecclesiastical benefices was one of the prevailing abuses in the Church. Lanfranc, with his usual sagacity and prudence, would not court defeat by endeavouring to reform with too much violence and haste. At the council of Winchester, in 1076, it was decreed that canons should not be married, but the parochial clergy, and priests dwelling in castles or manor houses, were not required to put their wives away. On the other hand, if unmarried, they were not to marry, and bishops were to take care that henceforth they did not ordain any one unless he declared himself to be unmarried.

At a national council held at Westminster in 1102, at

[1] See vol. i. pp. 372, 373, 383, 384, 410.

which Anselm and Gerard, Archbishop of York, were present, the rule was made more severe. Not only were all orders of clergy forbidden to marry, but those who had wives were to put them away. Sons of priests were not to succeed to their father's churches; the people were not to attend mass if celebrated by a priest who refused to part from his wife. Nevertheless these canons were so generally disregarded that Pope Pascal II. found it expedient to relax them. Writing to Anselm in 1107 he says that, understanding that the majority of the English clergy are married, he grants authority to the archbishop to ordain their sons, if their learning and conduct are satisfactory; and he empowers him to dispense with the canons in other respects, at his discretion, in consideration of the needs of the time and the uncivilised condition of the people. Council after council, however, re-enact former canons and frame new ones increasing in strictness. The Council of London, 1108, declared that priests who persisted in disregarding the canons must be deprived of their benefices and forbidden to officiate. The goods of those who lapsed were to be seized and delivered to the bishops; their concubines were to be treated as adulteresses. Another Council of London in 1126 forbade priests to have any woman in their houses except a mother, or sister, an aunt or some one entirely beyond suspicion. In 1129 a national council held at Westminster called upon the king to enforce the obedience of the refractory clergy. Henry, however, permitted them to retain their wives on payment of a fee or fine for the privilege; and as he made a good deal of money out of this transaction, it is clear that a large number of the clergy were still married.

Attempts to enforce it.

The practice was not suppressed in the thirteenth century. When the interdict was proclaimed in the reign of John, he seized the wives of the clergy and demanded heavy ransoms for their release. In the Council of Oseney, held in 1222, in the primacy of Stephen Langton, it was decreed that clergy who retained concubines in their houses, or had access to them elsewhere, so as to create scandal, should be deprived of their benefices. No clerk might bequeath anything by will to his concubine. If he did, it was to be converted to the use of

The attempts were ineffectual.

the church. Concubines who would not quit the houses of their partners after due warning were to be excluded from the church; if they persisted in their defiance they were to be excommunicated, and finally handed over to the secular power. The constitutions of Archbishop Edmund Rich in 1236, and the canons passed at the council over which Cardinal Otho, the papal legate, presided in 1237, laid down rules to the same effect. The frequent repetition of severe decrees in peremptory language sounds formidable, but as a matter of fact neither in this period nor in the times which follow, down to the reformation in the sixteenth century, was the celibacy of the clergy very rigorously enforced in the English Church. It must be borne in mind that secular clerks did not, like monks, take a vow of celibacy, and although their partners were stigmatised by opprobrious names, most of them were in fact married, and such unions were not void in themselves, but only voidable if the parties were brought up before the ecclesiastical court. Thus although the priest who scrupulously observed the rule of celibacy was no doubt held in the higher esteem, the married clerk was by no means regarded as a reprobate, and the high sounding penalties pronounced in the ecclesiastical synods against offenders were rarely enforced, except in a modified form.[1]

Learning and conduct of the clergy.

As to the ordinary standard of conduct and of learning amongst the parochial clergy, we have not very much direct evidence before the thirteenth century. It was certainly not high then, and it must have been lower still in the preceding period, especially in times of distraction and distress, such as the reigns of Stephen and John. St. Bernard, writing in the twelfth century, declared that it was no longer true that the priests were as bad as the people, for they were worse. His words refer to the clergy of the Church at large, but there is no reason to suppose that the English clergy were to be excepted from his remarks. The incidental notices of writers in the reign of Henry II., like John of Salisbury and Walter Map, even allowing for occasional exaggeration or heated feeling, or the selection of extreme instances, leave no room to doubt that the learning of the ordinary clergy was very scanty. In the

[1] See vol. iii. p. 259.

thirteenth century the practice begins to be common for rectors of parishes as well as canons of cathedrals to obtain leave of absence to study, for periods, varying from a year to three years, at one of the universities either in England or on the Continent, but the rank and file of the clergy, the vicars of impropriate churches, the parochial chaplains, the priest-vicars, and chantry priests, generally knew little more than just enough Latin to read their breviary and say mass.

The ordinary duties required of the parochial clergy may be gathered from the regulations made in the various provincial and diocesan synods, of which there are numerous records in the thirteenth century. How far these were obeyed is another question. They were forbidden to undertake any secular office, such as that of seneschal or bailiff, or any judicial office involving the power of inflicting capital punishment. They were to celebrate mass devoutly once a week at least; and the words of the canon, especially at the consecration of the host, were to be uttered clearly and fully. No priest was to celebrate twice on the same day except on Christmas and Easter day, or on the occasion of a funeral. Parish priests were to be diligent in teaching and preaching, lest they should be regarded "as dumb dogs when they ought, by their timely barking, to repel the attack of spiritual wolves." They were cheerfully and diligently to visit the sick whenever they were sent for, remembering the reward promised at the last judgment to those who ministered to Christ's suffering brethren. Duties of parochial clergy,

Archdeacons were admonished not to burden parishes with unnecessary charges on their visitations, to exact only reasonable procurations, not to be accompanied by foreigners, and to be moderate in the number of their retinue and horses.[1] It was their business to see that any errors in the canon of the mass were corrected; that the parish priests knew how to pronounce the words of the canon, and of the baptismal office properly, and had a sound understanding of the same; also that the laity were duly instructed in the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, and how to and of archdeacons.

[1] By a decree of a Lateran Council in 1179 the retinue of an archbishop during a visitation was limited to fifty horses, of a bishop to thirty, and of an archdeacon to seven; but these numbers seem to have been often exceeded.

administer baptism in cases of emergency, using the proper terms whether in the Latin, French, or English tongue. They were to keep lists of all the ornaments, vessels, and books of the church, which were to be submitted to them every year for inspection. The chalice in all churches was to be of silver, the altar was to be covered at the time of mass with a clean white linen cloth, and all attending on it duly vested in surplices. In the constitutions of Cardinal Otho, 1237, it is stated (can. 14) that grave scandal had arisen in the eyes of the laity, because some of the clergy dressed in military rather than clerical fashion. Bishops and archdeacons were to see that they wore their proper garb with close capes, that they were duly tonsured, and that the trappings of their horses were becoming. They were forbidden to take part in "scotales," as they were called. These appear to have been public feasts at which there were competitions in drinking. They were sometimes organised by royal officials, who invited people to drink ale, and then extorted money from them as a bribe not to vex or inform against them for any crimes of which they might be guilty.

Various rules were laid down as to confession. Bishops were to appoint discreet confessors in the several towns and cathedral churches every Lent. Confessions were to be heard three times a year, at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas. Any one who did not confess at least once a year to his own priest was not to be admitted to communion, and at his death was to be denied Christian burial. Confessions of women were to be received in an open part of the church, so that they might be seen of all, though not heard. The confessor was to listen with downcast eyes, not looking into the face of the person confessing; to deal with him in a spirit of gentleness, and exhort him to make a full confession. The names of persons with whom any sin had been committed were not to be asked, but their quality, whether clerks or laymen, and the like, might be made the subject of inquiry. In certain cases no one but the pope or his legate might grant absolution; although in such cases the sinner might be absolved if he was in *articulo mortis*, on the condition that if he recovered he should present himself to the pope with a letter stating the nature of his offence.

Confession.

As rural deans and incumbents might shrink from confessing to their own bishop, he was to appoint discreet men to act as confessors in each archdeaconry. In cathedral churches canons were to confess to the bishop, or the dean, or to some person or persons appointed by the bishop, dean, and chapter. In some instances, as at Salisbury, the office of confessor pertained by statute to the sub-dean.

The articles of inquiry at episcopal visitations, of which there are numerous specimens in the thirteenth century, especially in the time of Bishop Grosseteste, who set a splendid example in discharging this duty, prove that the clergy were expected to act as a kind of moral police, enforcing the laws of Christian discipline upon every class of society, and in every department of human life. Inquiries were to be made in every parish whether there were any who were notoriously guilty of any of the seven deadly sins; who lived in adultery or fornication; who were addicted to drunkenness, or practised usury, or harboured lodgers for immoral purposes, or had clandestinely contracted an illegal marriage, or had died intestate, or without receiving the last sacraments, or who persisted in occupying the chancel with the clergy, or caused markets, sports, or legal proceedings to be conducted in consecrated ground. Five or six persons selected from each parish were examined on oath respecting the condition of the church and its furniture, and the character and conduct of the clergy who served it. There are occasional complaints, as there have always been, of negligence in visiting, or in teaching the young, or of hurrying through the services, or of too long absences from the parish, or of an insufficient staff of clergy,[1] but on the whole the witnesses generally speak kindly and favourably of their ministers. Some are reported as discharging all their duties excellently, others as good men who did their best according to their knowledge (*quatenus noverint*). Bishop Grosseteste gives special instruction to the archdeacons and the parochial clergy as guardians of the morals and good behaviour of their flocks.

Visitation, inquiries, and injunctions.

[1] The normal staff prescribed by Grosseteste was, in addition to the rector or vicar, one deacon and one sub-deacon. When the revenues did not suffice for more there was to be one clerk, who was to assist the priest in the services, decently habited.

They were to suppress all riotous or licentious sports, especially the "Feast of Fools," as it was called, which had been celebrated in church on the Festival of the Circumcision, and which he denounces as a foul and profane practice; together with gluttonous proceedings at funeral feasts, and drinking bouts. They were also to warn mothers and nurses against overlaying their children at night, which seems to have been a very common occurrence at that time.

Hindrances to efficiency.

The two great hindrances to the efficiency of the parochial clergy in Bishop Grosseteste's time were the presentation to livings of foreigners, mostly Italians, at the request of the pope, or his legate; and of very young men, sometimes mere lads, through the influence of powerful relations. Grosseteste firmly refused to institute such presentees, but few prelates were as resolute and courageous as he was. The mere possibility of such appointments being made must have exercised a depressing and demoralising influence both upon the clergy and laity, and lowered the tone and standard of duty. In spite of his vigorous administration, Grosseteste, writing in 1250, three years before his death, bitterly declares that the indolence and negligence of many of the clergy, and the bad examples of conduct which they set to their flock, gave rise to innumerable evils, and filled him with such despair that he would have resigned his office had he been permitted. Hence the cordial welcome which he extended to the friars, both Dominican and Franciscan, but especially to the latter, as supplying the defects of the beneficed clergy.

Successive movements in the Church.

Nothing is more remarkable in the history of the Christian Church, nothing more indicative of its divine origin, and of the divine energy working within it, than the successive movements to which it has given birth, meeting from time to time just those moral and spiritual needs which were most dominant. The Christian Church has never been permanently stagnant; it has ever contained within itself a power of recovery and reformation. Men of heroic mould have arisen, distinguished by extraordinary saintliness, and zeal, and often combined with genius, or ability of a high order, gifted at any rate with the faculty of discerning what the special need of the time was, and of

devising a remedy for it; men capable of organising, guiding, and inspiring others, and training them to carry on the work after they themselves had departed from the world.

Such men, although many of them differed widely in modes of thought, character, and temperament, were all originators of great movements, or of great institutions. They took up some special side of Christian life, brought out into prominence some neglected portion of Christian duty, or Christian doctrine, pressed it home on the consciences of men, created interest in it, made it operative, gave it a fresh impulse. That they sometimes made mistakes, that they were sometimes narrow, or hard, or extravagant, if not fanatical, is no more than might be expected in men whose hearts and minds were concentrated with intensity of zeal upon a single object. That in many instances a movement, an association, or an institution, originally beneficial, should become degenerate, corrupt, perhaps mischievous, was inevitable, partly from the mere fallibility of human nature, partly from changes in the character of the time, and the cessation of the need which had called them into existence. But they did their work in their day; they brought their contributions to the sum of Christian thought and action, and the world was the better for them.

Among those who have been raised up to minister in a spirit of entire self-sacrifice to the destitute, the suffering, the sorrow-stricken, there has been none greater than St. Francis of Assisi; and the Order which he founded discharged for a time a special kind of work for which there was very urgent need, and had hitherto been no organised provision. The thirteenth century was the golden age of monasticism. The monasteries had long offered the blessing of a home in which men and women desiring to escape from the defilements of the world in turbulent and licentious times might prepare their souls in peace for life in another and a better world. The monastic Orders had become wealthy and were soon to degenerate, but their houses were still useful centres of education and civilisation. Nevertheless the spiritual care of the poor outside their walls was not their first consideration; and as many of these monasteries were in remote country places, the monks were not brought into close

St. Francis of Assisi.

contact with extreme poverty and distress. Moreover, in the rural districts, where every parish had its church and its pastor, and generally some rich landowner, the temporal and spiritual needs of the people were, as we have seen, fairly well provided for.

But in and around the towns a large neglected population was growing up. Settlers who did not belong to some guild of craftsmen were in a deplorable condition; physically, morally, and intellectually degraded. They lived for the most part in the suburbs, which were festering hot-beds of disease and vice. For although great advances had been made in municipal institutions, there had been no corresponding progress in provisions for physical health or material comfort. Streets and lanes were narrow and filthy; the stagnant ponds and ditches just outside the walls were receptacles of sewage and refuse of every description. Fever, ague, plague, and leprosy—that terrible scourge which had been imported from the East by the Crusaders—were rarely absent and often rampant. It was to the squalid and wretched inhabitants of these unhealthy quarters that the Franciscans devoted their ministrations. They came as poor to befriend the poor. Bareheaded, barefooted, clad in raiment of the coarsest stuff, depending for their daily food on the alms or hospitality of the charitable, they brought words of christian hope and consolation to the sin-laden and sorrow-stricken, they tended the sick and dying, they washed the sores of the homeless, outcast, excommunicated leper.

The Franciscans.

Together with leprosy and other diseases imported from the East, together also with a taste for oriental luxury and art and science, oriental heresies, chiefly of the Manichean type, had made their way into Western Christendom. The main object of St. Dominic in founding his Order of preachers was to combat these errors. He was the apostle of a pure faith, as St. Francis was the apostle of pure living. His disciples were to be the watch-dogs of the Lord (*Domini canes*), by their timely barking to ward off the ravenous wolves from the fold. Dominic made war on heresy by dogmatic teaching, to which his followers unhappily added the use of the sword. St. Francis and his disciples directly attacked misery and sin; but indirectly they

The Dominicans.

helped to undermine those oriental heresies which tampered with the truth of the Incarnation; for by their practical teaching and their example they brought out the human side of our Lord's character, and carried conviction to men's hearts of the reality of His sympathy both with mental sorrow and bodily distress.

Thirteen Dominicans, including their leader, Gilbert de Fraxineto, landed in England in the beginning of August 1221. They were welcomed by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, were permitted to preach in London and Oxford in the same month, and soon established themselves in most of the large towns. Although the Dominicans adopted the principle of poverty, in imitation or rivalry of the Franciscans, it was no part of their original constitution, and from the nature of their work, which was confined to preaching, and this mainly to the educated and intellectual, they did not command such widespread sympathy as the Franciscans, who won the love and admiration of all classes by their homely practical teaching, and by their self-denying lives of active benevolence.

Their arrival in England.

The first band of Franciscans who arrived in England landed at Dover on September 11, 1224. They were nine in number, five being laymen, and four clerics. Their leader, Agnellus of Pisa, who was about thirty years of age, and only in deacon's orders, had been warden of the Order in Paris, where he had gained a high reputation for piety and prudence. He had been nominated by St. Francis himself as the first minister for the province of England. Three of the company were Englishmen,—Richard of Ingworth in Norfolk, who was a priest of mature years; another, Richard, a young Devonshire man, who was an acolyte; and William of Esseby or Ashby, a novice. They were penniless; the monks of Fécamp had paid the expenses of their passage, and they were now dependent for the daily necessaries of life on the hospitality of the people amongst whom they came to minister. They asked for nothing but the coarsest fare and the meanest lodging. Five of the nine remained for a time at Canterbury, where they slept in a building which was used as a school by day. The other four meanwhile visited London, where they were lodged

Arrival of the Franciscans.

for fifteen days by the Dominicans. Then they obtained a plot of ground in Cornhill from John Travers, Sheriff of London, where they built a little house of the meanest materials, stuffing the partitions of the cells with dried grass. Other ground was afterwards offered them, but as it was contrary to the rule of their Order to hold any property, it was invested in the Corporation of London on trust for their use. Their chief settlement was by the Newgate, near the Shambles, a most unsavoury spot, known as "Stinking Lane." In less than two years the Order had settlements in Oxford, Cambridge, Northampton, Lynn, Norwich, Yarmouth, and other towns. In less than thirty years their numbers had risen to one thousand two hundred and forty-two, with forty-nine convents in various parts of the kingdom. At first all their houses, like the one in London, were of the simplest description. Their chapel at Cambridge was built by a carpenter in a single day. A kind-hearted citizen of Shrewsbury had the walls of their dormitory built of stone: the minister of the Order required them to be removed and replaced in clay. Decorations of all kinds were strictly forbidden; a friar at Gloucester who had painted his pulpit was deprived of his hood; the warden who had allowed pictures in the chapel suffered the same penalty. Even the use of books and writing materials was denied them: their preaching was to depend not on learning, but simply on their experience and observation of the people amongst whom they lived and to whom they ministered.

Such were the humble beginnings in England of this famous Order. No wonder that the people reverenced them and thought that they beheld in them the nearest approach to the life and work of their divine Master. With the parochial clergy they were not generally popular, for to many the activity and zeal of the Friars was a rebuke; the confessional also was interfered with, and offerings were diverted from the parish church. Some of the bishops also at first viewed them with suspicion; but by those who cared earnestly for the spiritual welfare of their people they were heartily welcomed; and by none more than Robert Grosseteste. One of his first requests, after he became bishop, addressed to his friend the learned Franciscan, Adam Marsh, and re-

Their popularity and usefulness.

peated to the Minister General in England, was that some brethren of the Order might constantly attend him to be employed in his vast diocese. In a letter to Pope Gregory IX. he speaks in the warmest terms of the value of their services; how their example promoted humility, temperance, unworldliness, patience, submission to authority. "If your holiness could but see how eagerly and reverently the people hasten to the brethren to hear the Word of Life, to confess their sins, to be instructed in the rules of Christian living, and what profit the clergy and religious derive from imitating their ways, you would indeed say that to those 'who dwell in the land of the shadow of death light has sprung up.'"

How the Franciscans, who began by abjuring learning, came to be the great promoters of it, and produced some of the most learned men, must be explained in the next chapter. The history of their decline and fall, how they who began as poor, self-denying mission-preachers, living on the voluntary alms of a grateful people, gradually sank into being lazy beggars, covetous and idle gossips, quack doctors, will-makers, pedlars, hucksters—all this belongs to a later period than that with which we are now dealing.[1] It is a sad tale, but only one amongst the many illustrations, which meet us at every turn in history, of the mingled nobleness and meanness, strength and weakness of human nature, the mingled greatness and littleness of human life; the *corruptio optimi* which is *pessima*.

Their decline and fall.

AUTHORITIES.—The notices of bishops in this chapter have been collected from a great variety of chronicles, more especially William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontif.* and *Gesta Regum*, Henry of Huntingdon, Roger of Howden, William of Newburgh, *Gesta Henr. II. et Ric. I.* (Benedict), Matt. Paris, and the *Annales Monastici*, 5 vols., with the Index, which is very full and valuable (these are all in the Rolls series). The *Materials for the Life of Thos. Becket*, 7 vols. (also in Rolls series), are full of information about other bishops as well as the primate, including original letters to and from Gilbert Foliot, which are particularly interesting. The story of the strife of Archbishops Baldwin and Hubert Walter with the monks of Christchurch, Canterbury, is contained in *Memorials of Richard I.*, vol. i. (Epistolæ Cantuarienses), with preface by Bishop Stubbs (Rolls series). For all that relates to Bishop Grosseteste, see his *Epistolæ*, ed. Luard (Rolls series), and his *Life* by F. S. Stevenson (Macmillan, 1899). On elections to bishoprics, and papal interference

[1] See vol. iii. pp. 313-320.

with them, see Bp. Stubbs's *Constit. History*, ch. xix. Decrees of councils, and episcopal and legatine injunctions and constitutions, will be found in Wilkins's *Concilia*. Interesting notices of the condition and character of the clergy are scattered throughout the writings of John of Salisbury, Walter Map, and Giraldus Cambrensis, but the statements of the two latter must be accepted with reserve, the remarks of Giraldus referring chiefly to the clergy in Wales, while both he and Walter Map were satirists and gossips who picked out extreme cases and made the most of them. For what relates to the friars the chief authority is *Monumenta Franciscana*, ed. J. S. Brewer (Rolls series); *The Coming of the Friars*, a little book by the Rev. Dr. Jessopp, is a pleasantly written account of their settlement in England.

CHAPTER XVI

POPULAR RELIGION, LEARNING, AND ART

THE most striking characteristic of religion in the period with which we have been dealing was its intense realism. The unlearned multitude were very much like children, simple-minded, impulsive, emotional, easily moved to tears, or laughter, or anger; imaginative and credulous, but most susceptible to impressions conveyed through the senses. These qualities had their good and their bad side. On the one hand, life was permeated by religion. The reality of heaven and hell, the existence and nearness of supernatural beings, were ever before men's minds. The world was full of mystery and wonder and awe. Conscience was sensitive, sin must be confessed and penitence expressed by an act of some kind, costing trouble or expense, whether it were to go on a crusade or a pilgrimage, to found a church or a monastery, or to make some offering, however small, to a shrine or an altar. The church was the rallying-point and centre of the common life in every place. Even those customs which had to be restrained or suppressed, such as holding markets, fairs, and even sports, in the precincts of the church, indicate how closely religion was interwoven with everyday life.

Realism—its good and bad side.

On the other hand, realism had a tendency to degenerate into coarse materialism. The practical religion of the illiterate was in many respects merely a survival of the old paganism thinly disguised. There was a prevalent belief in witchcraft, magic, sortilegy, spells, charms, talismans, which mixed itself up in strange ways with Christian ideas and Christian worship.

A passionate veneration for relics and belief in their virtue were carried to lengths which to us seem either ludicrous or disgusting. Fear, the note of superstition, rather than love, which is the characteristic of a rational faith, was conspicuous in much of the popular religion. The world was haunted by demons, hobgoblins, malignant spirits of divers kinds, whose baneful influence must be averted by charms or offerings. The idea of heaven was much more vague and indistinct than that of hell, of which the physical torments were depicted with horrible minuteness.

Saint worship.

The ordinary mind shrank from approaching the supreme Being, even the incarnate Word, except through the medium of the Blessed Virgin or of saints. Every kingdom, every place, every monastic Order had its tutelary saint. The legendary lives of saints became a kind of additional gospel. The miracles attributed to them, or alleged to be wrought by their relics, however childish or grotesque, were readily credited. The temptation to invent or magnify them was strong, because, once believed, the saint became an object of veneration, and the visits and offerings of devotees were a great source of wealth to the place and to the church which contained his shrine.

Elementary religious teaching.

In the most essential elements however of religion the people were generally well instructed. The clergy were required, both before and after the Norman Conquest, to teach their flocks the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten commandments in the mother tongue. They were also instructed how to administer baptism in the proper form in cases of emergency; and how to follow the several movements in the eucharistic service intelligently. A manual called the *Lay Folks Mass Book*, composed by a canon of Rouen about 1170, and translated into English near the end of the thirteenth century, explains the meaning of every detail in the service and ritual, tells the worshippers what to do, and aids their devotion and memory by putting some of the prayers and explanations of the rubrics into rhyme. Some of these simple rhyming directions might be used with advantage at the present day; for example, "when the priest says 'sursum corda,' then lift up your heart and body and praise God with the angels":—

"Sweet Jesu grant me now this,
That I may come to Thy bliss,
There with angels for to sing
The sweet song of Thy loving,
Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus
God grant that it be thus."

From very early times manuals were in use called "Horn-books," because the leaves were protected by thin layers of horn. They contained a few simple prayers in addition to the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. Horn-books and Prymers. Larger manuals, called Prymers, contained also the seven penitential psalms, a litany, and most of the prayers and canticles to be used at the canonical hours, together with the decalogue, and a list of the seven deadly sins. A favourite book with the more educated laity was the Book of Hours, to be observed in honour of the Blessed Virgin, including, besides a litany and the penitential psalms, and "psalms of degrees," the vigils of the dead, and the commendation. Many of these Hour-books were beautifully illuminated. Besides private and catechetical instruction, the clergy were expected to edify their people by sermons in church, but from incapacity or indolence many of them were negligent of this duty. Hence the eagerness with which the preaching friars were welcomed by the people, the jealousy with which they were regarded by the parochial clergy, and the stress laid by the bishops of the thirteenth century, in their injunctions to the clergy, on the duty of preaching.

While the religion of the common people was tainted by materialism, the philosophy of the learned brought out the spiritual side of christianity, and endeavoured to sound the depths of the most profound mysteries. Philosophy and theology. At the time of the Norman Conquest western Europe had fairly emerged from the intellectual darkness which had enveloped it in the first half of the tenth century. The revival of learning had begun in Germany, under the Saxon Emperor, Otto the Great. The papacy, which for fifty years had been at the disposal of profligate women and licentious nobles, was first rescued from that abyss of infamy when Otto placed his cousin, the austere and learned Bruno, in the apostolic see as Gregory V., 996 A.D. Bruno was suc-

ceeded by Gerbert as Sylvester II., 999, a man of extraordinary learning, but rather as a mathematician and a natural philosopher than a theologian. He was also somewhat of a political intriguer. Under these two great popes the standard of learning and morals was raised amongst the clergy, especially in Germany and Gaul, and the foundations were laid of reforms which, after the lapse of another fifty years, were matured by Leo IX., 1048-1054, and Hildebrand, who became Pope Gregory VII. in 1073, and had for many years before been the directing spirit of the papacy.

Nominalists and Realists.

In philosophy there were two great rival schools, divided upon the question of the nature of being. The Realists, deriving their principles from Plato, held that the true existence was the ideal. Every conception of the mind had necessarily a corresponding reality. "Universals," as, for example, justice or humanity, were real existences, of which the individual was only a part or manifestation. The Nominalists, on the other hand, held that individuals were complete existences in themselves, and that Universals were not real existences at all, but only mental generalisations of observed facts; the idea of justice, for example, was formed from experience and observation of just acts, the idea of humanity from observation of individual persons. At the beginning of the eleventh century Realism was the system in favour with the orthodox and conservative churchmen. The Realist relied mainly on authority; the Nominalist, on the other hand, depended on reason and logic as the instrument by which reason worked.

Berengar of Tours.

Reason and logic came into conflict with the dogmas of the Church. Roscelin, a canon of Compiègne, applying the Nominalist methods to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, incurred the charge of teaching tritheism, for which he was cited to answer before a council at Soissons in 1092. Berengar of Tours, a disciple of Fulbert, the learned Bishop of Chartres, who had himself studied under Gerbert, questioned the established doctrine of a corporal presence in the holy Eucharist, reproducing arguments supposed to have been employed two hundred years before by the daring and original thinker, John Scotus Erigena. The book, however, attributed to John, *On the Body and Blood of Christ*,

was almost certainly the work of his contemporary, the monk Ratramn. The Word, according to the teaching of Berengar, united Himself to the bread and wine after consecration, but the elements themselves remained unchanged in essence.

During a period of thirty years, 1050-1079, the suppression of this heresy, as it was regarded, continued to occupy the efforts of the doctors of the Church. No less than fourteen councils were held. In four of these Lanfranc took a prominent part as the champion of orthodoxy in opposition to Berengar. The book which he afterwards wrote on the subject probably represents the line of treatment which he had adopted in his pleadings before the councils, and affords us some insight into the habit and temper of his mind. It exhibits him as essentially the man of authority and order. As might be expected in a lawyer, he attaches the greatest weight to precedent. He will not condescend to discuss the established doctrine. The dogmas of the Church are in his opinion too firmly rooted to be really shaken by the foolish speculations of rash and vain men. He regrets that he should be compelled to waste his time in refuting idle errors, but as the ancient peace of the people of God has been disturbed by them, they must be opposed. He will not argue with his adversary, but taking his propositions one by one he subjects them to a battery of texts from Holy Scripture and the Fathers. It is the work of a keen, subtle, sharp-witted man, skilled in the artifices of the professional lawyer; just the kind of man required by the pope to defend established doctrine, just the kind of man to be serviceable to the Conqueror in reorganising both the Church and State; a lawyer, a diplomatist, an ecclesiastical statesman endowed with shrewd, practical wisdom rather than a theologian or philosopher; a man of talent rather than genius, a skilful advocate or exponent of some established position rather than an originator of any new ideas or new system of thought.

Lanfranc.

Anselm, the successor of Lanfranc in the see of Canterbury, is such a unique personality that he cannot be reckoned as belonging to any particular school of thought. His meditations and prayers breathe a spirit of fervent love to God, and of the humblest faith; his letters reveal his human sympathy, full of tender,

Anselm's *Monologion* and *Proslogion*.

affectionate, playful humour, courtesy, and respectfulness, together with courage in reproving what he believed to be wrong; his philosophical and theological treatises are the products of an original, subtle, and daring intellect. His fame rests mainly upon three works, the *Monologion*, the *Proslogion*, and the *Cur Deus Homo?* The *Monologion*, or "single discourse," as it was called, to distinguish it from a dialogue, is an attempt to prove the existence of God by pure reason, without the aid of Scripture or of any appeal to authority. It is an application of the Platonic theory of "ideas" to the demonstration of Christian truth. Starting from the contemplation of sensible objects, he raises the question whether the goodness in all good things, such as justice in a man, strength or swiftness in a horse, and so on, although called by different names, comes from one source or many. If all varieties of excellence, whatever be their names, are resolvable at last into a few simple elements, the good, the beautiful, the great, the useful, he concludes that all things to which any of these qualities pertain must derive them from some existence which is in itself absolutely and unchangeably good and great. Moreover, as there is a difference of rank in natures, a horse being superior to a dog, and a man to a horse, there must be one nature so superior to all others that it cannot be exceeded by any; otherwise there would be no end to the series, which is absurd. This supreme existence must be its own author; it must be by means of itself (*per se*) and from itself (*ex se*). It must be *per se*, for if it was by means of another, that other would be the greater, which is contrary to the supposition. It must be *ex se*, for if it came out of nothing it must be brought out of nothing, either by itself or by another; by itself it could not be, for then itself would be prior to itself, which is absurd, nor by another, for then it would not be the highest nature; it must be therefore self-existent from all eternity. By similar logical chains of reasoning, Anselm proceeds to prove the eternal existence of the Word and the Holy Spirit.

In the *Proslogion* or Address, so called because it is cast in the form of an address to God, Anselm proves the existence of the Deity by a shorter method. Starting from the contemplation not of the outer, but of the inner world, not from sensible objects but from the mind of man, he could, he

thought, demonstrate the being of a God out of the very saying of the fool that there was no God. For that very denial involved the idea of a Being than whom no greater can be conceived; but if no greater can be conceived then He must exist, since existence is essential to the idea of perfection. This is substantially the argument employed by Descartes six hundred years afterwards, although there is no positive evidence that Descartes was acquainted with Anselm's writings. It is to be noted that neither Anselm nor Descartes seek to prove the existence of God in order to *produce* belief, but starting from belief, their aim is to show that reason independently followed necessarily confirms the convictions of faith.

His *Cur Deus Homo?*

The aim of the *Cur Deus Homo?* (Why did God become Man?) is to prove the necessity of the Incarnation as the only possible means whereby the debt of obedience due from man to God could be discharged, an adequate reparation made for his offences, and the immortality of body and soul recovered for which he was originally destined. It is in the form of a dialogue, which renders it easier reading than the other two treatises, although the reasoning is not less close and cogent.

Places of education.

The chief centres of education in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were (i) the schools connected with monastic houses and cathedral churches; (ii) the houses of bishops; (iii) the universities of Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, which all came into being in the latter part of the twelfth century. The rule of St. Benedict prescribed that four hours daily should be devoted to study, and the best Benedictine abbeys were homes of learning. "A cloister without a library is like a fortress without an arsenal," was a proverbial saying quoted by St. Bernard. "Our books," said St. Hugh, when prior of the Charterhouse at Witham, "are our delight and riches in peaceful times, our weapons and armour in time of war, our food when we are hungry, our medicine when we are sick." William of Malmesbury remarks that neglect of letters in a monastery was a sure sign of decay. All abbots who cared for the welfare and reputation of their houses made it their business to collect books, and multiply copies by transcription. Abbesses also were sometimes very learned women, and the transcription of

manuscripts was one of the regular occupations of Benedictine nuns. The schools attached to monasteries were partly for boys who were designed or dedicated for cloister life (*oblati*), partly also for others (*nutriti*) who had no such vocation; in many cases children of the nobility, and especially of the founder or benefactors of the house. The abundant quotations or illustrations from the Bible in all writers trained in the monastic schools prove that it was the subject of careful study, but many of the more learned display familiarity also with classical Latin authors, particularly the poets. The ordinary course of studies in mediæval schools was divided into the two classes, called Trivium and Quadrivium; the former consisting of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, or logic; the latter of arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy; and to these must be added, in many of the monastic houses, some knowledge of medicine, and of various arts, drawing, working in metal, and above all architecture. Theology was regarded as the crown and completion of all sciences.

Monastic chronicles.

The literary productions of the most lasting value which issued from the monastic houses were the chronicles. "Without the monks," it has been truly said, "we should have been as ignorant of the history of our country as children." Most convents kept some diary of events in which they were concerned; and these local annals throw a great deal of light upon the social and religious condition of the people, not only in the immediate neighbourhood, but in the country at large. But many of them also record or refer to public events, and occasionally they rise to a high level in the hands of writers who had real historical ability. Such, to mention a few only of the most eminent examples, are the Chronicles of William of Malmesbury and William of Newburgh, in the twelfth century, and Matthew Paris in the thirteenth.

William of Malmesbury.

William of Malmesbury, born somewhere between 1090 and 1096, was brought up from childhood in the Abbey of Malmesbury. From an early age he was distinguished for his diligence in study, including logic, law, ethics, and medicine; but his special interest was history. He set to work to collect information from all sources, documentary, traditional, oral, and by the year 1125

he had completed two of his most important works, the *Gesta Regum* (*Acts of the English Kings*), and the *Gesta Pontificum* (*Acts of the English Bishops*). He had already been for some years librarian of the monastery. If not actually resident for a time at Glastonbury, which a passage in one of his Lives of Glastonbury saints would almost seem to imply, he certainly had much intercourse with the brethren there, and his connection with the two great abbeys of the west country, which were rich storehouses of material for the early history of England, was a great advantage to him. Moreover, it is clear from his descriptions of places that he had travelled in many parts of the country, northwards even as far as Carlisle; and he was intimate with three great men who had played a distinguished part in the political history of the time,—Roger, Bishop of Salisbury; Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester; and Robert, Earl of Gloucester.

William of Newburgh.

William of Newburgh tells us that he was born in the first year of the reign of Stephen, 1136. He was brought up from boyhood in the priory of Newburgh in Yorkshire, which was an offshoot from the Augustinian priory of Bridlington. Unlike William of Malmesbury, he seems never to have travelled beyond the immediate neighbourhood of his home. Newburgh, however, being on the main road from York to the North, the priory was a halting-place for travellers of all sorts and conditions, from whom William might glean a great deal of information, and his constant communication with the abbots of the neighbouring Cistercian houses, Byland and Rivaulx, brought him into touch with the whole Cistercian Order, which was an important factor at that time in the history of western Europe. His *Historia Rerum Anglicanarum* (*History of English Affairs*), which covers the reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., is undoubtedly the finest historical work of the twelfth century. It is written in remarkably pure Latin. The author frequently quotes Virgil and Horace, and shows some acquaintance with Cicero and Livy. He was clearly familiar with the writings of St. Augustine and Gregory the Great, and with translations of Eusebius and Josephus. But what is of more importance, he takes a wide and comprehensive view of persons and events, and shows such judgment and discrimination in the

use of his materials that he has been called "the father of historical criticism." He did not, like William of Malmesbury, avowedly aim at being a successor, in the domain of history, of the venerable Bede, but as a matter of fact he came nearer that ideal than William of Malmesbury, indicating the causes and consequences of events with a finer perception and insight.

Matthew Paris.

Matthew Paris entered the great Abbey of St. Albans in 1217, when he was probably seventeen years of age. The house had long been one of the chief centres of learning in England. The first Norman abbot, Paul, a nephew of Lanfranc, had endowed the scriptorium; Abbot Simon re-endowed it, enriched the library, and kept some skilled copyists constantly at work. Roger of Wendover was the chronicler of the house when Matthew Paris entered it. Matthew, who was diligent in all manner of studies, including drawing, painting, and metal-work, assisted in the composition of the Chronicle, and carried it on after Roger's death in 1236. The abbey was frequently visited by great people, from whom Matthew picked up much valuable information. He was, indeed, patronised by persons of high rank, and by the king, Henry III., with whom he was on such intimate terms that he did not scruple to reprove him for his misrule. His narrative is made very entertaining by stories of what he heard and saw the king and other great personages say and do. For example, he relates that when the papal nuncio Martin was dismissed the country and asked for a safe-conduct, the king exclaimed, "May the devil conduct you to the infernal regions!" He travelled about a great deal to collect information, and to witness public ceremonies; and was employed by Haco, King of Norway, to reform the Abbey of St. Benet Holm in the province of Trondhjem.

The first part of his *Chronica Majora* is a revision of an early compilation down to 1188, and of the Chronicle of Roger of Wendover, from 1189-1235; the continuation from 1235-1259 is the original work of Paris. It is far superior to local annals; the interests of the writer were European; he touches upon the affairs of Italy, France, and Germany, on the Crusades, and the relations of the empire and the papacy. His

narrative is fresh and vigorous, garnished with plentiful quotations from Latin authors, and adorned with some drawings in the margin, probably executed by his own hand.

Among historical writers and men of learning who received their education, or at any rate pursued their studies, in episcopal households, Henry of Huntingdon was one of the earliest, and not the least distinguished. He was born about 1080; his father, who was a clerk of some distinction, perhaps an archdeacon, had settled at Lincoln, where Bishop Remigius had fixed the see of the vast diocese that stretched from the Thames to the Humber, and had formed a chapter of the most learned and capable men whom he could gather round him. Remigius died in 1092, and Henry was taken at an early age into the household of his successor, Robert Bloet, who lived in a style of great magnificence. By this bishop he was made Archdeacon of Huntingdon, and by the next bishop, Alexander, 1123, a nephew of the famous Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, he was encouraged to write a history. For Alexander, although much occupied with the political troubles of Stephen's reign, was a man of learning and a patron of learned men, and amongst others of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who dedicated his version of the prophecies of Merlin to him in very flattering terms. Henry of Huntingdon.

When Archbishop Theobald went to Rome in 1139 to fetch his pall, Henry accompanied him, in what capacity or for what purpose is not known. On the way he visited Bec, and we may presume was brought into connection with some of the learned men whom Theobald delighted to gather round him. For the history of Britain in Roman and Saxon times Henry, of course, had to depend on various writers—Eutropius, Nennius, and Bede—and from the death of Bede down to 1126 his principal source was the *Saxon Chronicle*. As his critical power was not great, and he was apt to give the rein to a rather lively imagination, the value of this part of his history is not very great; but for the latter part of the reign of Henry I., and the whole of Stephen's reign he supplies a great deal of useful information. He died very soon after the accession of Henry II. in 1154. He quotes Virgil occasionally, and Horace once, and his Latinity, although disfigured by a rather turgid style, is above the average

standard of his time. He also preserves traditions, and national songs and sayings, a characteristic which may be due to the fact that he was not a monk, like most other chroniclers, but a secular priest, and therefore had more intercourse with people of all sorts and conditions.

John of Salisbury.

By far the most distinguished English scholar of the twelfth century, and perhaps the best read man of his time in Europe, was John of Salisbury. Born at Salisbury between 1115 and 1120, he went to Paris in 1136 and studied logic, first under the renowned philosopher Abelard, who was then near the end of his chequered and unhappy career, and afterwards under his successor, Alberic, who became Archdeacon of Reims, and also under Robert of Melun, who was made Bishop of Hereford. Grammar he studied under William of Conches at Chartres. Paris, Laon, and Chartres had long been the three principal centres of learning for western Europe. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, who died in 1029, had been a pupil of the learned Gerbert. Bishop Ivo, who died in 1115, one of the greatest authorities on canon law, had attended the lectures of Lanfranc at Bec. After him the brothers Theodoric and Bernard, both canons and chancellors of the cathedral, acquired a high reputation as teachers, especially of classical learning. Bernard's pupils, William of Conches, Richard l'Eveque, who became Bishop of Avranches, and Gilbert de la Porée, who became Bishop of Poitiers, were all distinguished scholars, but as humanists rather than theologians. In this school John of Salisbury laid in large stores of classical learning, which enabled him to become one of the best Latin writers of his time.

But although he loved classical literature, he esteemed theology the noblest of all studies, and he returned to Paris to pursue it under the foremost masters there—the Englishman Robertus Pullus or Pulleyn, and Simon of Poissy. Ethics he studied in the school of Hugh of St. Victor. Logic he regarded as a fruitless thing except as an auxiliary to other studies. Apart from them it was as useless as the sword of a Hercules in the hands of a pigmy; it had come to be studied too much as an end in itself, a mere idle display of technical casuistical combat between smatterers and sophists. After finishing his course of studies at Paris, John spent some

time as chaplain or secretary with Peter, abbot of the Cistercian house of Moustier de la Celle, near Reims, and was brought into friendly relations with the great St. Bernard, who recommended him in 1148 to Archbishop Theobald. As the confidential secretary and friend of Theobald, John was much employed in negotiations with the papal court. According to his own statement in 1159 he had crossed the Alps ten times, and had twice been into Apulia. He was a personal friend of Nicholas Brakespear, who became Pope Adrian IV., and he obtained his sanction of the expedition of Henry II. for the conquest of Ireland. But he fell under the displeasure of the king in his strife with Thomas Becket, for adhering to the side of the primate and maintaining that the independence of the Church was essential to the very existence of Christianity. On the other hand, he was Becket's wisest counsellor, and tried to moderate his impetuous speech and action. He left England in 1163, returned with Becket in 1170, and was an eye-witness of his murder. In the revulsion of public feeling after that event, he was restored to favour at court, and, after acting as secretary to Archbishop Richard, was made Bishop of Chartres in 1176, and died there in 1180.

His most important literary production is a treatise bearing the curious title *Polycraticus* (by which he probably meant a "statesman's guide-book") *de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum*, or "the triflings of courtiers and the footprints of philosophers." The first part of it deals with abuses and corruptions both in the State and Church, the cruelties of the forest laws, the iniquities of the justices in eyre (rightly called "errantes," seeing that they erred from the path of justice for rewards), the degeneracy of knighthood, the luxury and extravagance of the royal court, the prevalence of simony, the promotion of worldly men to the highest ecclesiastical offices, the extortionate charges in the ecclesiastical courts, the pernicious effect on discipline of the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction obtained by the monastic houses. All these evils are described in language of severe satire, but with an ethical purpose, which is to show what serious impediments they are to the healthy life of the State. The ideal state, as conceived by John of Salisbury, was a living organism of

which religion should be the soul, and the prince the head, administering law which came from God, the members being the several classes of society. As in the State the secular should be subordinate to the spiritual power, so in the individual the spirit should govern the senses, the ideal rule the material. The whole treatise is garnished with quotations and illustrations, derived more largely from classical writers than from the Bible or the Fathers, and only equalled in their variety and profusion by Jeremy Taylor, or Burton, the author of the *Anatomy of Melancholy*.

Other scholars.

More or less contemporary scholars with John of Salisbury, some of them fellow-students with him at Paris, or companions in the household of Archbishop Theobald and Thomas Becket, were John of Poitiers, a native of Kent, probably of Canterbury, made Treasurer of York, then Bishop of Poitiers in 1162, and Archbishop of Lyons in 1181; Ralph of Sarr in Thanet, who was Dean of Reims, 1176-1194; Ralph de Diceto, the learned and historical Dean of St. Paul's; the industrious chronicler, Roger of Howden; Peter of Blois, the learned Archdeacon of Bath; the clever Welshman, Walter Map, scholar, theologian, versifier, satirist, collector of anecdotes and gossip, diplomatist and ambassador, canon of St. Paul's, precentor of Lincoln, and finally Archdeacon of Oxford. A little younger than Walter was Gerald de Barri, better known as Giraldus Cambrensis, the busy, bustling Archdeacon of St. David's, an ambitious candidate for the see, but doomed to disappointment, a keen observer of nature and men, and a ready, dashing, versatile writer upon all manner of subjects;—the topography and scenery of Ireland and Wales, the character and customs of the people, the delinquencies of the clergy, the scandals of the court;—always vigorous, lively, and entertaining, he has been deservedly styled "the father of popular literature."

The universities.

The close of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries witnessed the rise of universities. As we have seen, Paris had long been a centre of teaching, especially in theology and the arts, and Bologna was the principal centre of teaching in law—both civil and canon law. But the existence of a school, or schools, did not

entitle a place to be called a *studium generale*, or university, unless it was open to students from any part of the world, and unless one of the higher faculties, theology, law, or medicine, was taught there by a number of masters, organised into some kind of guild or corporation.

At Paris the university was a direct development of the cathedral school which had begun to be renowned under William of Champeaux, the master of Abelard. The University of Oxford was not in like manner the offspring of the Church. There was no cathedral there, nor indeed any ecclesiastical body on a large scale. The university probably owed its origin to an expulsion of English students from Paris about the year 1167. Henry II. issued an edict about that time forbidding any clerk or monk to visit the Continent without special license, and commanding all clerks who had revenues in England to return within three months, or in default to forfeit their revenues to the crown. It is significant that before this date there are no allusions in writers of the day to Oxford under the name *studium generale*, whereas after it they are numerous. Throughout the twelfth century, indeed, there had been schools at Oxford, as at Paris, conducted by learned men; but these were private ventures. Thus we learn from the correspondence of one Theobaldus Stampensis, between the years 1101 and 1117, that he had from sixty to a hundred clerks under his instruction at Oxford; and Robertus Pullus certainly taught theology there in 1133. The alleged residence of the learned Lombard, Vacarius, as a lecturer in law in 1149, rests on precarious evidence. He was employed by Archbishop Theobald as his advocate in a dispute with Bishop Henry of Blois about rights of jurisdiction, and he very probably gave lectures to the scholars whom the primate had gathered round him at Canterbury. And although it is quite possible that, as in most other seats of learning, the early schools at Oxford may have been in connection with the principal church, and that this church may have been the priory of St. Frideswyde, there is no positive evidence of the fact. Two writers near the end of the twelfth century supply the most direct testimony to the existence of a university. Giraldus Cambrensis, in his self-laudatory account of how he read his *Topography of Ireland*, on three successive days, to the

students at Oxford in 1180, speaks of doctors of different faculties, and scholars of various ranks, rich and poor. The Chronicler, Richard of Devizes, writing in 1192, says the clerks in Oxford were so numerous that the city could scarcely sustain them.

The Chancellor of Oxford.

Most of the continental universities being the offspring of a cathedral school, were originally subject to the control of the cathedral chancellor, as the official superintendent of education. The University of Paris only gradually and painfully acquired independence of the capitular body. In Oxford, on the contrary, which was 120 miles distant from Lincoln, the cathedral city of the diocese, the chancellor had no connection with the chapter. For some time there was no chancellor, at least no official bearing that title; the chief director of education was called rector or master of the schools, a post which Grosseteste held before he was made Bishop of Lincoln. The difference, however, between rector of the schools and chancellor was one in name rather than in fact. The important point is that he was elected by the body of masters, and although the appointment had to be confirmed by the Bishop of Lincoln, the distance of the bishop from Oxford impaired his authority and strengthened that of the chancellor, who gradually acquired for himself and the university a unique position of independence. Functions which in Paris were divided between several personages, representative of different authorities,—the king, the bishop, the pope, and the municipality,—were at Oxford all centred in the chancellor. The first colleges in Oxford were established just at the close of the period with which we have been concerned. Walter de Merton founded the college, which perpetuates his name, for the education of theologians in 1264, and about the same time, perhaps a little earlier, Sir John de Balliol began the foundation of a college for poor scholars, as a penance for some wrong that he had done to the Church of Durham. The University of Cambridge owes its origin to a great migration of students from Oxford in 1209, consequent on a riot provoked by the death of a woman who had been accidentally killed by a scholar. Several clerks had been imprisoned, and two were executed by order of King John.

The Dominicans made a settlement in Oxford in 1222. Three years afterwards the Franciscans also came there. The experimental study of physics began with this Order, who were naturally, almost necessarily, led to it by their contact with human suffering and sickness. Their itinerant lives also afforded opportunities, which the inquiring were not slow to use, of learning much about the products of various countries, and making observations in natural history and science. But experience soon taught them that the study of theology also was indispensable. The oriental heresies, to which reference has been already made, were very prevalent amongst the low population in the towns to whom the friars more especially ministered, and to convert them from their errors it was necessary to enter into their moral and intellectual difficulties. Agnellus of Pisa, the leader of the first band of Franciscans in England, built a school in their Fratry at Oxford, and, in the words of their own Chronicler, Eccleston "persuaded Master Robert Grosseteste, of holy memory, to read lectures there to the brethren. Under him, within a very short time, they made incalculable progress in sermons, and in subtle moralities suitable to preaching." The reputation of the English friars increased so rapidly, that brother Helias, the minister-general, sent for brother Philip Waleys and brother Adam of York to read lectures at Lyons. Readers were appointed in Hereford, Leicester, Bristol, Cambridge, and Oxford; and the gift of wisdom so overflowed in the province of England that in the time of William of Nottingham (minister-general 1240 to 1251), there were as many as thirty lecturers in England, and a regular succession of them was provided in the universities.

Learned friars at Oxford.

The English friars were indeed fortunate in having secured the services of Grosseteste. He was an intellectual giant; the range of his learning was unrivalled, embracing philosophy, mathematics, geometry, physics, as well as theology. He was a prolific writer on all these subjects. He had some knowledge of Greek, and even Hebrew, a rare accomplishment in those days, and there is now no doubt that the Latin version of what is called the *Middle Recension* of the Epistles of St. Ignatius was made by him, or under his direction. But what constituted

Bp. Grosseteste their patron.

his chief claim to the gratitude, both of his contemporaries and posterity, was that he directed all his learning to practical ends. Theology in his hands was ethical rather than speculative. He preached in English as well as Latin. Among the subjects of his treatise entitled *Dicta Theologica* were faith, grace, prayer, pride, detraction, humility, patience, the mercy and justice of God, true and false prophets. In lectures and disputations he was not content to depend on the favourite text-book of the day, the Sentences of Peter Lombard, but referred straight to the original text of the Holy Scriptures, and exhorted all his pupils to do the same. He did much to teach men the true value of the Aristotelian ethics, and to train them in the proper application of logical methods to the interpretation of Holy Scripture, so as to bring out its literal and practical meaning rather than the allegorical and mystical.

Second only to the great Bishop Grosseteste, "that learned clerk," in the extent of his learning and the versatility of his gifts, was his intimate friend Adam de Marisco, or Adam Marsh, the first brother of the Order appointed by Grosseteste to read lectures at Oxford. His practical abilities were equal to his learning. He mediated in the disputes of the university with the chancellor, or with papal legates, or the burgesses of the city, or the king. He was consulted and employed on various missions, requiring tact and judgment, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, by the Queen, by the Earl and Countess of Leicester. Wherever questions of church discipline had to be decided, or a crusade had to be preached, or an important chapter of the Order was going to be held, he was in request. Under his training and influence the Oxford friars acquired a European reputation; they supplied professors to the foreign schools and universities; and foreign students resorted to the English school as superior to all others. From that school proceeded, to mention only a few of the most distinguished names, Alexander Hales, who taught in Paris; Richard of Coventry, John Wallis, Thomas Bungay, John Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, the great schoolmen, Duns Scotus and Ockham; and above all Roger Bacon, an extraordinary genius, rarely if ever equalled in originality and comprehensiveness.

Adam Marsh.

In the two centuries which we have been considering, artistic genius was pre-eminently displayed in architecture. Two styles, commonly known as the Norman and the Early English or Lancet, were brought to perfection. And although both these styles were common in their main principles to all buildings, civil and military as well as religious, it was in the churches that they reached the highest standard of excellence. As the churches afforded the best scope for displaying all the constructive and decorative varieties of which the style was capable, so did religion supply the highest motive for effort. Lower motives, indeed, might be combined with the religious, and help to stimulate it—a spirit of individual or local pride and emulation, or the desire to honour and secure the favour of some tutelary saint, but underlying these was the right feeling that a building designed to be "the palace of the Lord God," and dedicated to His worship, should be the best in every respect that the mind of man could devise, and that the hand of man could execute. Art, in fact, has ever reached its highest level when it has been inspired by religion, and consecrated to the service and glory of God.

Architecture.

It has been shown in the preceding volume of this history[1] that the style of building in England before the Norman Conquest was a local variety of that primitive Romanesque which grew out of the classical Roman style, and which in the main features was common to all those regions of western Europe that had been embraced by the Roman Empire. National and local varieties of Romanesque were developed in Lombardy, in Germany, in southern Gaul, and in Normandy. As Eadward the Confessor brought Normans to his court and put Normans into some of the English bishoprics, so he built his great abbey, the West Minster, begun in 1065, in the Norman style. William of Malmesbury expressly says that this was a novel style in England, but that after its introduction it was generally adopted. This, indeed, in respect of new buildings, was an inevitable result of the Norman Conquest. But it is remarkable that the Normans were not content to retain the old English churches, at least in the more important places,

The Norman style.

[1] See vol. i. pp. 191, 192.

as they found them, although some of them, from the descriptions which have come down to us, appear to have been of considerable size; and the few small churches, or fragments of churches, which have survived as specimens of the older style, prove that it was not wanting in a certain dignity and beauty of its own. Nevertheless the Norman bishop or abbot almost invariably demolished the existing church of his see or monastery, and rebuilt it on a larger scale in the style of his own country, although some flavour of the old English Romanesque may be traced here and there in parts of the Norman building, as at St. Albans, Tewkesbury, and in the transepts of Winchester Cathedral. And it seemed as if the Normans liked to display their strength on the conquered soil by erecting minsters on a vast scale. They did not build any churches in Normandy itself so large as old St. Paul's, St. Albans, Winchester, or Ely. The normal type of a great Norman minster was a Latin cross with a long nave, rather short transepts, and a short eastern limb ending in an apse. Internally the choir was generally extended under the central tower, and often included one bay west of it. The west end was commonly flanked by two towers, but in some instances, as at Ely, there was only one in the centre of the west front. The earliest Norman minsters, St. Albans, 1077; Winchester, 1079-1093; Norwich, 1096-1109, are severely plain, almost to sternness, but deeply impressive from their massiveness, solemn dignity, and noble proportions; the principal arcade, the triforium, and clerestory forming three stages nearly equal in height. In Durham, begun by William of St. Calais in 1093 and completed by Ralph Flambard, we reach the most perfectly beautiful development of Norman ever achieved; a typical example in its massive grandeur of northern Romanesque, as the Duomo of Pisa, a nearly contemporary building, is of the lighter and more delicate form which Romanesque assumed in southern regions.

In the reign of Henry I. a lighter style of Norman, with more richness of ornament, began to be introduced, partly through the influence of Bishop Roger of Salisbury. In the west front of Lincoln Cathedral the plain work of the first builder, Bishop Remigius, 1085-1092, presents a marked contrast to the part built by Bishop Alexander, 1146, the nephew of Bishop Roger

of Salisbury. The development of this richer style was hindered by the anarchy of Stephen's reign, but was revived and consummated in the reign of Henry II. The heavy piers of the earlier style, whether square, with shafts in the angles, or cylindrical, are supplanted by lighter columns, and the old cushion capital, originally an imitation of the Doric, is wrought out into elaborate forms, sometimes supplemented by foliage almost rivalling the Corinthian style in richness; windows, doorways, and arches are bordered by a profusion of ornament. Notable examples of this later style are the nave of St. David's Cathedral, Selby Abbey, the chapel of St. Joseph at Glastonbury, and the Galilee at Durham, where the arches originally rested on two slender shafts under a single abacus, such as one sees in cloisters in Italy, Sicily, and southern France. It was only in this later phase of the style that vaulting was used for large spaces. In the earlier period wide spaces, as of the naves and choirs of churches, were covered with flat, wooden ceilings, or occasionally with a cylindrical vault, as in the chapel of the White Tower of London. The aisles were vaulted with plain groining without bosses or diagonal ribs. The earliest instance of Norman vaulting on a large scale is the choir of Canterbury, 1174, but it is possible that the vaulting of the nave at Durham may be still earlier.

The Norman style was gradually superseded in the latter part of the twelfth century by the Lancet or Early English, of which the pointed arch, lancet-shaped windows, and a round abacus are the characteristic features. The pointed arch, which had been employed for centuries by the Saracens, found its way into Sicily and southern Gaul in the eleventh century, and we see it creeping into English buildings from the middle of the twelfth century. Sometimes a pointed arch is seen resting upon piers of Norman character, and retaining the Norman mouldings and decorative forms; sometimes, on the other hand, we see round arches with Gothic mouldings. Transitional work, as it is called, of this kind is well illustrated in the nave of Malmesbury Abbey, parts of St. Cross Church, and Romsey Abbey in Hampshire, part of the nave of Worcester, and the whole of the eastern limb of Canterbury Cathedral. In some places the general character

Early English or Lancet style.

of the earlier style was retained to nearly the end of the twelfth century, as in the naves of Ely and Peterborough, although the mouldings and other details are in the later fashion.

In fully developed Early English the round-headed arch and window altogether disappear; the choirs are carried to a greater length and are square ended, the apse when it existed in Norman churches being generally removed. The long, narrow windows are sometimes grouped together in twos, threes, or larger numbers under an enclosing arch; and the first approach to tracery occurs when the space or spandril, as it is called, above the light is pierced with a quatrefoil or other simple figure. Polygonal chapter-houses are built supported by a single central pillar, branching out at the top. The west front is often built up broader than the nave and aisles, to which it forms a kind of screen or transept. At Peterborough it takes the form of a deep vestibule, supported by three arches of extraordinary height and beauty. Sometimes, as at Wells and Salisbury, it is a mere wall overlapping the aisles, built up for the display of sculptured figures.

Geometrical style.

In the latter half of the thirteenth century, tracery, which grew out of the piercings made in the heads of two-light or three-light windows enclosed under an arch, became more developed. The enclosing arches were made larger, so as to include five, seven, or even eight lights, and the heads were worked out into a number of simple figures, circles, quatrefoils, and trefoils. This style, called the Geometrical, stands midway between the pure Early English and the later style, commonly called Decorated, in which the lines of the tracery are less formal and more flowing. What is called the Angel Choir at Lincoln Minster, 1255-1280, and the great east window are noble specimens of this intermediate stage. So also are the chapter-house at Salisbury and the nave of Lichfield.

Sculpture and painting.

In the Norman period the representation in stone of animal forms, especially of the human figure, are very rude and grotesque; but in the thirteenth century they become much more refined and life-like, while nothing can exceed the graceful beauty of the foliage carved on the capitals of columns, and of the slender shafts that are clustered round them. In the mural fresco,

also, in the painted window, and in the illuminated manuscript of this century there is a wonderful richness and exuberance of fancy, together with a certain simplicity and freshness of design which have a greater charm than the more ornate and elaborate efforts which belong to later periods of art.

The thirteenth century was the golden age of the mediæval Church in England. If the massy piers, the heavy, round-headed arches, the flat ceilings, the horizontal lines of the Norman buildings are typical of the stern strength of the conquering race, and retain, solemn and impressive though they are, some impress of the hard, prosaic, pagan, Roman style from which they were borrowed; on the other hand the soaring pointed arches, the lofty pillars with their graceful, clustered shafts, the vaulted ceiling, the high-pitched roofs of the thirteenth century cathedral are no less typical of a free Christian people, full of exuberant life, poetical imagination, manifold activities, aspiring thoughts and aims.

General influence of the Church.

In looking back over the period which we have traversed we must gratefully recognise in the Church the most potent and beneficent agent in shaping the life and destiny of the English nation. Notwithstanding many obvious defects inseparable from the rudeness of the age, together with germs of corruption which developed only too rapidly in the hard, cold, selfish times which succeeded the thirteenth century, the Church was undoubtedly the chief source and centre of progress and civilisation. In the early days after the Norman Conquest she helped to draw the conquerors and the conquered together, and to weld them into one people. In times of political distraction and confusion she preserved the principles of order, discipline, and government, and supplied some of the ablest ministers of State. Her wisest prelates conducted the national resistance to royal and papal tyranny, and took a leading part in securing the Great Charter, the permanent bulwark of national liberty. In the monasteries she provided homes of industry, peace and religious devotion in an age of violence, licentiousness, and strife; in the friars she sent forth preachers of righteousness, and ministers to the needs of the poor and suffering. She was the mother and nurse of the best learning and the highest art.

AUTHORITIES.—The character of popular religion may best be gathered from a careful study of the lives and letters, where they exist, of bishops, together with their Constitutions, and from incidental notices in the Chroniclers, and the writings of scholars like Giraldus Cambrensis, John of Salisbury, and Walter Map; *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages*, E. P. Cutts; S.P.C.K. contains some useful information. For philosophy and learning, in addition to the original works mentioned in the text, see *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, R. L. Poole, M.A. (Williams and Norgate) and *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Hastings Rashdall, M.A., Ox. University Press. For architecture, besides the buildings themselves, which are the best materials for study, and such well-known books as Fergusson's *History*, and Parker's *Glossary of Architecture;* chap. xxvi. in Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, vol. v., will be found very instructive; also his *History of Architecture* (Parker), now unfortunately a rare book, and his masterly *Sketch of English Architecture*, prefixed to Bædeker's *Handbook to Great Britain*. Papers by the late Professor Willis on Canterbury, Winchester, and Lichfield Cathedrals, and on Glastonbury Abbey in the *Journal of the Archæological Institute*, some of which have been separately issued, are of singular merit and interest.

APPENDIX I

SOME PRINCIPAL EVENTS

	A.D.
Council of Winchester; Archbishop Stigand deposed	1070
Lanfranc consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, August 29	1070
Council of London; Removal of Episcopal Sees	1075
Council of Winchester	1076
Walcher, Bishop of Durham, slain	1080
Death of William the Conqueror, September 9	1087
Death of Lanfranc, May 24	1089
Anselm consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, December 5	1093
Council of Rockingham	1095
Pope Urban II. proclaims the Crusade at Council of Clermont	1095
Accession of Henry I. and return of Anselm	1100
Council of London and settlement of Investiture Strife	1107
See of Ely founded	1108
Death of Anselm, April 21	1109
Legatine Council at Westminster	1125
Archbishop William of Corbeil becomes *Legatus natus*	1126
First settlement of Cistercians in England at Waverley	1128
See of Carlisle founded	1132
King Stephen seizes and imprisons Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln	1138
Thomas Becket consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, May 27	1162
Council of Clarendon, January 25	1164
Council of Northampton, October 7	1164
Murder of the Archbishop, December 29	1170
Council at Westminster; dispute for precedence between primates of Canterbury and York	1176
Baldwin consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury	1185
Hugh of Avalon consecrated Bishop of Lincoln	1186
Capture of Jerusalem by Saladin	1187
Archbishop Baldwin goes on Crusade	1189
Hubert Walter consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury	1193
He holds Legatine Council at York	1195
Stephen Langton consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury	1207
King John excommunicated	1209
He does homage for his dominions to the pope	1213
The Great Charter granted	1215

	A.D.
Death of John	1216
First arrival of Dominicans in England	1219
First arrival of Franciscans	1224
Pope Honorius III. demands English prebends	1226
League for expulsion of Foreign Clerks	1231
Edmund Rich consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury	1234
Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln	1235
Archbishop Edmund resigns	1240
Council of Lyons	1245
Death of Bishop Grosseteste	1253
Parliament of Oxford	1258
Battle of Lewes, May 14	1264
Battle of Evesham and death of Simon de Montfort, August 4	1265
Council at St. Paul's under the Legate Cardinal Othobon	1268
Accession of Edward I.	1272

APPENDIX II

(TO CHAPTER IV)

TABLE exhibiting the changes made in the occupants of Episcopal sees in the reign of William the Conqueror and part of the reign of William Rufus.

ABBREVIATIONS.—*E* = English, *N* = Norman, *L* = Lotharingian, *F* = French, *d.* = died, *dep.* = deposed.

See.	Bishop at time of Conquest.	Appointed.	Vacated.	Successor.	Appointed.
Canterbury .	Stigand, *E* .	1052	*dep.* 1070	Lanfranc, *N*	1070 May 23
York . .	Ealdred, *E* .	1061	*d.* 1069	Thomas of Bayeux, *N*	1070 May 23
London .	William, *N*.	1051	*d.* 1075	Hugh of Orival, *N*	1075
Winchester .	Stigand, *E* .	1047	*dep.* 1070	Walkelin, *N*	1070 May 23
Durham .	Æthelwin, *E*	1056	*dep.* 1071	Walcher, *L* .	1071
Dorchester .	Wulfig, *E* .	1053	*d.* 1067	Remigius, *N*	1067
Elmham .	Æthelmar, *E*	1047	*dep.* 1070	Herfast, *N* .	1070
Exeter . .	Leofric, *E* .	1050	*d.* 1072	Osbert, *N* .	1072
Hereford .	Walter, *L* .	1061	*d.* 1079	Herbert Losinga, *L*	1079
Lichfield .	Leofwin, *E* .	1053	*d.* 1067	Peter, *N* .	1072
Ramsbury .	Hermann, *L*	1045	*d.* 1078	Osmund, *N* .	1078
Rochester .	Siward, *E* .	1058	*d.* 1075	Arnost, *N* .	1076
Selsey . .	Æthelric, *E*	1058	*dep.* 1070	Stigand, *N*.	1070
Wells . .	Gisa, *L* .	1061	*d.* 1088	John of Tours, *F*.	1088
Worcester .	Wulfstan, *E*	1062	*d.* 1095	Sampson, *N*	1096

LIST OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS AND

KINGS OF ENGLAND	A.D.	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY	A.D.	ARCHBISHOPS OF YORK	A.D.
Willliam I. (The Conqueror)	1066	Lanfranc . .	1070	Thomas of Bayeux	1070
William II. (Rufus)	1087				
		Anselm . .	1093		
Henry I. . .	1100				
				Gerard . .	1101
				Thomas II. .	1109
		Ralph d'Escures	1114		
				Thurstan . .	1119
		William of Corbeil	1123		
Stephen . .	1135				
		Theobald .	1139		
				Henry Murdac	1147
				William Fitz-Herbert	1153
Henry II. .	1154			Roger of Pont l'Eveque	1154
		Thomas Becket	1162		
		Richard of Dover	1174		
		Baldwin . .	1185		
Richard I.	1189				
				Geoffrey Plantagenet	1191
		Hubert Walter	1193		
John . .	1199				
		Stephen Langton	1207		
				Walter Gray .	1216
Henry III. .	1216				
		Richard . .	1229		
		Edmund Rich .	1234		
		Boniface of Savoy	1245		
				Sewall de Bovill	1256
				Godfrey de Ludham	1258
				Walter Giffard .	1266
Edward I. .	1272	Robert Kilwardby	1273		

PRELATES WITH THE DATES OF THEIR ACCESSION

POPES	A.D.	KINGS OF FRANCE	A.D.	EMPERORS	A.D.
		Philip I.	1060	Henry IV.	1056
Alexander II.	1061				
Gregory VII.	1073				
Victor III.	1086				
Urban II.	1088				
Pascal II.	1099				
				Henry V.	1106
		Louis VI. (The Fat)	1108		
Gelasius II.	1118				
Calixtus II.	1119				
Honorius II.	1124				
				Lothar II.	1125
Innocent II.	1130	Louis VII. (The Young)	1137	Conrad III.	1138
Celestine II.	1143				
Lucius II.	1144				
Eugenius III.	1145				
Anastasius IV.	1153			Frederick I. (Barbarossa)	1152
Adrian IV.	1154				
Alexander III.	1159				
		Philip II. (Augustus)	1180		
Lucius III.	1181				
Urban III.	1185				
Gregory VIII.	1187			Henry VI.	1190
Clement III.	1187			Philip and Otto IV. (rivals)	1198
Celestine III.	1191				
Innocent III.	1198			Otto IV.	1208
Honorius III.	1216			Frederick II.	1212
		Louis VIII.	1223	Conrad IV. and William (rivals)	1250
		Louis IX. (St. Louis)	1226	Interregnum	1254
Gregory IX.	1227			Richard, Earl of Cornwall and Alphonso, King of Castile (rivals)	1257
Celestine IV.	1241				
Innocent IV.	1243				
Alexander IV.	1254				
Urban IV.	1261				
Clement IV.	1265				
		Philip III.	1270		
Gregory X.	1271			Rudolph of Hapsburg	1272

APPENDIX IV

NOTE ON THE TAXATION OF THE CLERGY

AFTER the Norman Conquest the bishops and Religious Houses held much of their land under the Crown on the tenure of military fiefs, from which the service of a certain number of knights, according to assessment, could be required; but the system of paying scutage, a money composition in lieu of furnishing a military contingent, was established as early as the reign of Henry I. Henry II. in 1159, in addition to the legitimate scutage, imposed an arbitrary tax on each See and Religious House ranging from small sums to 500 marcs, a proceeding which was bitterly resented. St. Hugh of Lincoln in 1197, as we have seen (above, p. 203), maintained that he was not bound to provide personal military service outside England, and in this contention he was supported by the main body of the bishops.

In process of time not only the landed property of the clergy, but also their spiritual revenues, consisting of tithes and offerings, were subjected to taxation. One of the first occasions on which this took place was "the Saladin tithe," a tenth levied on all revenues and movables in 1188, to contribute to the crusade after the capture of Jerusalem. The books, vestments, and sacred vessels of the Church were exempted from this tax, but in the subsequent levy for the ransom of King Richard I. even these did not escape.

The most direct and systematic attempts to tax clerical revenues began with the reign of John. In January 1207 he summoned the bishops and asked them to permit grants to be made from the revenues of the beneficed clergy to aid him in the recovery of Normandy. The request, which was repeated in the following month, met with an indignant and unanimous refusal, as being an exaction quite unprecedented and intolerable.

The reign of Henry III. was, as the pages of this book will have abundantly shown, one long struggle on the part of the clergy to resist the reiterated efforts of their two oppressors, the King and the Pope, to extort money from them on various pretexts. The importance of this struggle, from a constitutional point of view, was considerable. Oppression stimulated the spirit of independence in the clergy, and the discussion of public questions in their assemblies became more frequent. "It was by action on these occasions," says Bishop Stubbs (*Constit. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 176), "that the clerical estate worked out its distinct organisation as an estate of the realm, asserting and possessing deliberative, legislative, and taxing powers, and in so doing provided some not unimportant precedents for parliamentary action under like circumstances."

INDEX

Abbots, deposition of, 43, 121; rules respecting, 121; duties of, 266, 267
Abelard, 320
Acre, siege of, 201, 202
Adela, Countess of Blois, 126, 144
Adeliza of Louvain, second wife of Henry I., 139
Adrian IV., pope (Nicholas Brakespear, 151, 321
Ælfheah, St., or Alphege, 62, 63
Ælfwig, abbot of the New Minster, Winchester, 7
Æthelric, bp. of Selsey, 17, 34
Æthelsige, abbot of Ramsey, 16
Æthelwine, bp. of Durham, 11, 15
Æthelwold, bp. of Winchester, 248
Agnellus of Pisa conducts Franciscans into England, 305, 325
Ailred, abbot of Rivaulx, his description of the founder, 258
Albans, St., abbey of, 22, 25, 44; a seat of learning, 318
Alberic, a papal legate, 146
Alexander II., pope, 4, 25, 52
Alexander III., pope, 161, 174
Alexander IV., pope, releases Henry III. from his oath, 244
Alexander, bp. of Lincoln, 147; seized by King Stephen, 148; a patron of learned men, 319
Amesbury, nuns of, expelled, 186
Amiens, the "Mise of," 244
Anselm, St., 2, 3, 27; visits Lanfranc, 62, 63, 84, 85; early life of, 81-85; first meeting of, with William Rufus, 86; nominated to See of Canterbury, 88, 89; consecrated, 92; strife of, with William Rufus, 91-108; in Rome and Apulia, 108, 109; at council of Bari, 109, 110; at council in Rome, 111; returns to England, 115; his first dispute with Henry I., 116; marries Henry to Matilda, 117; makes peace between Henry and Robert of Normandy, 118; strife of, with Henry I. about lay investiture, 119-128; his last days, 129-131; his writings, 313-315
Anselm, abbot of St. Saba, 134, 135
Appeals to Rome, 69, 226, 283, 291
Archbishoprics, mode of electing to, 284
Archdeacons, character of, 292; duties of, 299
Architecture, growth of, 2; styles of, 327-330
Arnulph, bp. of Lisieux, 177
Augustine, St., abbey of, at Canterbury, 46; resistance of, to Lanfranc, 47
Augustinians or "black canons," 1, 143; houses of, in England, 265
Avranches, school of Lanfranc at, 22

Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, 129
Baldwin, abp. of Canterbury, 192; crowns Richard I., 198; goes with crusaders to Palestine, 201; dies there, 202; his strife with the monks of Christchurch, Canterbury, 288-290
Balliol, John de, his college at Oxford, 324
Bari, council of, 109, 115

Bartholomew, bp. of Exeter 161
Basset, Fulk, bp. of London, 244
Bath made a bishop's see, 51, 72
Battle Abbey, church of, consecrated, 94; account of its foundation, 251, 252; its privileges, 253
Bayham, Premonstratensian abbey of, 265
Beaulieu, Cistercian abbey of, 263
Bec, abbey of, 23-26, 82, 123, 127
Becket. *See* Thomas
Benedict, St., 196; rule of, 315
Benedictines, the reform of, 1; rule of, not strictly kept before Norman conquest, 248; Lanfranc's reform of, 249
Berengar of Tours, his teaching on the Eucharist, 312; opposed by Lanfranc, 313
Berkshire, clergy of, resist demands of papal legate, 236
Bernard, bp. of St. David's, 139
Bernard, St., 151, 153, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 298
Bishops, character of Norman, in England, 274; three types of, 276; influence of, 282
Bishoprics, modes of electing to, 283; papal interference with, 283, 284; difference between the mediæval and modern idea of, 284
Black Canons, 265. *See* Augustinians
Blundel, John, elected abp. of Canterbury, rejected by the pope, 228
Bologna, study of law at, 292; university of, 315, 322
Boniface of Savoy, abp. of Canterbury, 234, 244
Bouvines, King John defeated in battle at, 217
Brakespeare, Nicholas. *See* Adrian IV.
Brand, abbot of Peterborough, 7
Byland, abbey of, transferred from order of Savigny to Citeaux, 262

Calixtus II., pope, 136, 138, 140
Cambridge, university of, 324
Canon Law, study of, 50, 292, 322
Canons, regular and secular, 265
Canterbury, rivalry between see of, and York (*see* York, cathedral of); cathedral rebuilt, 33; architecture of cathedral, 329
Cantilupe, Walter de, bp. of Worcester, 237, 244, 245
Carlisle, see of, founded, 143
Carthusians, the, 1; their houses in England, 266
Cathedrals, two classes of, 286; revenues of, 287; relation of bishops to, *ib.*
Celestine II., pope, 151
Celibacy of clergy, attempts to enforce, 296-298
Chancellor, the, of Oxford University, 324
Chapelries, 295
Chaplains, royal, character of, 276
Chapters, cathedral, 287
Charles the Great, 3, 21
Charter, the great, granted, 218; annulled by papal Bull, 219; confirmed, 221; aid of the Church in obtaining, 331
Chester, Earl of, opposes papal tax, 226
Chester, made a bishop's see, 50
Chichester made a bishop's see, 50
Christchurch, Canterbury, monks of, their strife with archbishops, 288-291
Chrodegang, bp. of Metz, his rule for secular canons, 10, 36, 248
Cirencester, abbey of, 143
Cistercians, the, 1; mulcted by King John, 213; foundation of the Order, 255; rules of, *ib.*; settlements of, in England, 257-263
Clairvaux, abbey of, founded, 256
Clarendon, council of, 167; constitutions of, 167-169, 174, 185
Clergy, character of the English, 27, 28; rules concerning, 121, 141, 142; the parochial, 293; from what classes drawn, 295; learning and conduct of, 298, 301; duties of, 299
Clerks, trial of criminous, 165
Cluniacs, the, taxed by King John, 212; their rule, 250; their houses in England, 253-255; weak points in their system, 255
Cluny, abbey of, 21, 250, 253, 254, 255
Conches, William of, 320
Confession, rules concerning, 300

Conversi, the, in monasteries, 269; house of, at Fountains, *ib.*
Councils, ecclesiastical, 48. *See* under Westminster, London, Winchester, and Windsor
Courts, separation of civil and ecclesiastical, 49, 164
Coventry made a bishop's see, 50
Crema, John of, papal legate, 141
Cross, St., hospital of, 271, 272, 278
Crusades, the, 1, 104, 151, 198, 201
Cuthbert, St., 196
Cyprus, conquest of, by Richard I., 202

David, king of Scotland, 146
David, bp. of Bangor, 143
David's, St., see of, 143
Decretum, the, of Gratian, 292
Devizes, bishops besieged in castle of, 148
—— Richard of, 324
Diceto, Ralph de, dean of St. Paul's, 278, 322
Domfront, possession of Henry I. in Normandy, 119
Domnaldus, Irish bp., 57
Dunstable, priory of, 143, 265
Dunstan, St., 28, 248
Durand, a papal envoy, 213
Durham, monastery of, taken under papal protection, 222; minster of, 328

Eadgar the Ætheling, 6
Ealdred, abp. of York, 6, 10, 11, 16
Edmund, son of Henry III., crown of Sicily bought for, 243
Edmund Rich, 2; elected abp. of Canterbury, 228; his early life, 229; reproves King Henry III., 231, 232; retires to Pontigny, 233; dies there, *ib.*; character of, 277
Education, seats of, 315; nature of, 316
Edward, son of Henry III. (afterwards Edward I.), 245; character of, 247
Eleanor of Provence, queen of Henry III., 231
Ely, abbey of, 46; see of, founded, 129, 143
Erigena, John Scotus, 312
Ermenfrid, papal legate, 13, 17
Ernost (or Arnost), bishop of Rochester, 35
Ernulf, bp. of Rochester, 133
Espec, Walter, founder of Rivaulx Abbey, 258
Eugenius III., pope, 151, 152, 257, 262, 264
Eustace, son of king Stephen, 153, 154
Evesham, battle of, 247
Eynsham, Walter of, elected abp. of Canterbury, 225; rejected, 226

Falkes de Breauté, a foreign conspirator, 225
Fitz-Herbert, William, abp. of York, 151; appointment of, opposed by Henry Murdac, abbot of Fountains, 151, 261
Fitz-Nigel, Richard, bp. of London, 199, 278
Fitz-Osbert, William, a leader of insurrection, 203
Fitz-Peter, Geoffrey, justiciar, 205, 216
Fitz-Stephen, William, chaplain and biographer of Thomas Becket, 172; present at his murder, 181, 182
Fitz-Urse, Reginald, one of the murderers of Thomas Becket, 180, 182
Flambard, Ralph, minister of William Rufus, oppresses the Church, 75-78; bp. of Durham, 118; imprisoned by Henry I., *ib.*; escapes, *ib.*; incites Robert of Normandy to invade England, *ib.*; character of, 277
Fleury, new type of Benedictinism imported from, 248
Foliot, Gilbert, 2; abbot of Gloucester, 153; bp. of Hereford, *ib.*; opposes election of Thomas Becket to primacy, 161; bp. of London, 163; at council of Northampton, 172; his position in the strife with Thomas Becket, 176, 178, 180; death of, 199; life and character of, 280, 281
Foreigners, appointment of, to English benefices, 302
Foulquois, Guy, papal legate, 286

Fountains, abbey of, its foundation, 259, 260; offshoots from, 261; "domus conversorum" at, 269
Francis, St., of Assisi, 196, 303
Franciscans, the, 1, 304; arrival of, in England, 305; first settlement of, in London, 306; rapid increase and popularity of, *ib.*; favoured by Robert Grosseteste, 307; position of, in Oxford, 325; decline of, 307
Frederick I., emperor, goes on crusade, 201; dies on journey, *ib.*
Frederick II., emperor, his strife with the papacy, 226; marries sister of Henry III., 231; remonstrates with Henry III., 237; deposition of, pronounced by pope, 240
Fretéval, meeting at, between Henry II. and Thomas Becket, 179
Fulbert, bp. of Chartres, 312, 320
Furness, abbey of, transferred from order of Savigny to Citeaux, 262

Geoffrey, bp. of Coutances, 7, 34, 66
Geoffrey, natural son of Henry II., made bp. of Lincoln, 192; compelled to resign, *ib.*; elected abp. of York, 205; his strife with the chapter, 205-207; with William Longchamp and king John, 207, 208; death of, 208
Gerard, abp. of York, 101, 119, 121
Giffard, William, bp. of Winchester, 122, 128, 257
Gilbert Foliot. *See* Foliot
Gilbert, bp. of London, "the Universal," 145
Gilbert de la Porée, bp. of Poitiers, 320
Gilbert, St., of Sempringham, founds religious Order, 264; canonised, 265
Giraldus Cambrensis, his character and writings, 322, 323
Gisa, bp. of Wells, 10, 19, 36
Glanville, Ralph, minister of Henry II., 199; goes on crusade, 201
Glastonbury, abbey of, 43, 44
Gloucester, councils at, 48, 87
Gray, John de, bp. of Norwich, 210
Gray, Walter, abp. of York, 295
Gregory V. (Bruno), pope, 311
Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), pope, 52, 53-55, 312
Gregory IX., pope, his strife with the Emperor Frederick II., 226; demands a tenth of movables, *ib.*; sends legate Otho to England, 232
Grim, a Canterbury monk, present at murder of Thomas Becket, 181, 182, 183
Grosseteste, Robert, bp. of Lincoln, 2, 234; rebukes King Henry III., *ib.*; friend and adviser of Simon de Montfort, 235; opposes exactions of king and pope, *ib.*; one of a committee for reform, 237; urges united action, 238; his relations to the papacy, 241; his bold speech at Lyons, 241, 242; refuses canonry to nephew of the pope, 242; death of, 243; summary of his character, 282; his vigorous administration, 301, 302; his partiality for the Franciscans, 306, 307, 325; is rector of the schools at Oxford, 324; his great learning, 325, 326
Gualo, Cardinal, papal legate, secures throne for Henry III., 221; crowns him, *ib.*; his great power during minority of Henry III., 222; his wealth, *ib.*
Guitmond, a Norman monk, refuses preferment, 47
Gundrada, wife of William of Warren, founds with him priory at Lewes, 253, 254
Gundulf, bp. of Rochester, 25, 35, 104, 275
Guthlac, St., hermit, 196
Guy, papal legate, 117

Hakington, attempts of abp. Baldwin to found college at, 289
Harding, Stephen, abbot of Citeaux, 255
Harold, king of England, 4, 5
Henry I., king of England, 3; his coronation, 115; his strife with Anselm, 116, 119-128; taxes the clergy, 126; keeps see of Canterbury vacant, 132; fines the married clergy, 143; charter of, 218
Henry II., duke of Anjou, 3, 153; lands in England, 154; character of, 156; coronation of, 157; makes

Thomas Becket chancellor *ib.*; and abp. of Canterbury, 160; quarrels with him on three points, 163-165; the strife prolonged, 166-180; his distress and penance after murder of the primate, 185, 186; revolt of his sons, 185; his religious foundations, 186; makes Hugh of Avalon prior of Witham, 187; dies, 198
Henry III., 2, 3; crowned at Gloucester, 221; again at Westminster, 223; declared of age, 225; dismisses Peter des Roches, *ib.*; falls again under his influence, 229; and that of foreigners, 230; his extravagance, *ib.*; reproved by abp. Edmund Rich, 231; again dismisses Peter des Roches, *ib.*; marries Eleanor of Provence, *ib.*; reproved by Robert Grosseteste, 234; his exactions, 237; his difficulties and debts, 243; defeated at battle of Lewes, 245, 246
Henry of Blois, bp. of Winchester, 144, 145, 146; made papal legate, 147; tries to make Winchester an archiepiscopal see, *ib.*; turns against his brother King Stephen, 150; supports Empress Matilda, *ib.*; deserts her side, 151; deprived of legatine commission, *ib.*; suspended, 152; decline of his power, 154; retires to Cluny, 159; consecrates Thomas Becket, 161; at Council of Northampton, 171, 172; visited by Henry II., 184; his hospital of St. Cross, 271; his character, 279
Henry IV., emperor, 55
Henry the Lion, 176
Herbert of Bosham, friend and biographer of Thomas Becket, 170, 172, 173
Herbert, bp. of Salisbury, 203
Hereward, leader of English revolt, 45
Herfast, bp. of Elmham, 19, 58, 276
Herluin, abbot of Bec, 18, 23
Herman, bp. of Sherborne, 19; his see shifted to Old Sarum, 50
Hervé, first bishop of Ely, 143
Hilary, bp. of Chichester, 161, 167, 172, 253
Hildebrand. *See* Gregory VII.
Honorius II., pope, 141
Honorius III., pope, writes to Henry III., 221; correspondence of, with the legate Gualo, 222
Horn-books, 311
Hospitals, religious character of, 271, 272
Hour-books, 311
Hoveden or Howden, Roger of, chronicler, 322
Hubert, papal legate, 18
Hubert de Burgh, justiciar, 223; upholds Great Charter, 224; supported by abp. Stephen Langton, *ib.*; chief director of affairs, 225; dismissed and imprisoned, 229
Hubert Walter, 2; bp. of Salisbury, 199; goes on Crusade, 201; his military skill, 202; conducts crusaders home, *ib.*; elected abp. of Canterbury, 203; tax levied by, *ib.*; resigns justiciarship, 205; crowns king John, 209; dies, *ib.*; character of, 277; his strife with monks of Christchurch, Canterbury, 290, 291
Hugh, Cardinal, papal legate, 191
Hugh of Avalon (St. Hugh of Lincoln), prior of Witham, 187, 188; bp. of Lincoln, 192; his character and work, 193-196; his swan, 196, 197; resists a demand of Richard I., 203, 204; supports Geoffrey, abp. of York, 207; warns and rebukes king John, 208, 209; dies, 212; his character, 277
Hugh, abp. of Lyons, 108, 112, 114
Hugh de Morville, one of the murderers of Thomas Becket, 180
Hugh of Nonant. *See* Nonant
Hugh of Puiset. *See* Puiset
Hugh of Wells, bp. of Lincoln, 212
Huntingdon, Henry of, his life and writings, 319, 320

Ilchester, Richard of, bp. of Winchester, his character and work, 278
Illuminating, the art of, 331
Innocent II., pope, 145
Innocent III., pope, 3, 210; directs election of Stephen Langton, 211; lays England under interdict, *ib.*;

invites Philip, king of France, to invade England, 213; receives submission of king John, 214; annuls the Great Charter, 219; suspends abp. Stephen Langton, *ib.*; dies, 220
Innocent IV., pope, supports Henry III., 238; declares emperor Frederick II. deposed, 240; holds council at Lyons, *ib.*
Interdict, England under, 211
Investiture by laymen to ecclesiastical benefices forbidden, 112; opposed in England by Anselm, 116; and by pope Paschal II., 119; strife concerning, between Anselm and Henry I., 119-128; result and import of the strife, 130, 131
Isabella, sister of Henry III., marries emperor Frederick II., 231
Ivo, bp. of Chartres, 22, 25, 320

Jerusalem, capture of, by the Saracens, 201
Jocelyn, bp. of Salisbury, 180
Jocelyn, bp. of Bath, 211
John, king of England, 2, 200; warned and rebuked by St. Hugh of Lincoln, 208, 209; crowned, *ib.*; quarrels with Innocent III., 210; deposed, 213; becomes a vassal of the pope, 214; is reconciled to Stephen Langton, 215; attempts to invade Poitou, 215, 216, 217; defeated at Bouvines, 217; grants chapters right of free election, 218; grants the Great Charter, *ib.*; tries to evade it, 219; his crown offered to Louis of France, 220; his death, *ib.*
John of Oxford, dean of Salisbury, an opponent of Thomas Becket, 180
John of Salisbury, 2, 151, 153, 181; his life and learning, 320-322

Kenilworth, the Dictum of, 247
Kirkham, Austin priory founded at, by Walter Espec, 258
Knights Hospitallers, houses of the, in England, 271
Knights Templars, houses of the, in England, 271

Lambeth, abps. Baldwin and Hubert Walter attempt to build collegiate church at, 289, 290
Lanfranc, 2, 3, 4; early life of, 20-23; prior of Bec, 24; meets William the Conqueror, 25; abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen, 8, 27; abp. of Canterbury, 17, 19, 29-35, 46, 47; his relations to the papacy, 54, 55; his patriarchal authority, 56-58; acts as guardian of the kingdom, 59, 60; his meeting with Anselm, 62, 63; crowns William Rufus, 65; his death, 73; his character, *ib.*, 274; his monastic reforms, 249; his theology, 313
Langton, Simon, brother of abp. Stephen, 211, 228
Langton, Stephen, abp. of Canterbury, 2; elected by direction of the pope, 211; consecrated at Viterbo, *ib.*; stays at Pontigny, 212; visits Rome, 213; king John reconciled to, 215, 216; reads Charter of Henry I. to Council of London, 216; appeals against action of papal legate, 217; supports demand for the Great Charter, 218, 219; suspended, 219; at Rome, *ib.*; returns to England, 220; crowns Henry III., 223; gets three privileges from Rome, 224; supports Hubert de Burgh and resists Otho, papal legate, 224, 225; dies, 225; his character, 277
Layfolk, Mass Book of the, 310
Legates. *See* Papal legates
Leo III., pope, 3
Leo IX., pope, 26, 312
Leofric, bp. of Exeter, 10, 36
Leopold, duke of Austria, takes Richard I. captive, 202
Lewes, Cluniac priory founded at, 245, 253, 254; battle of, 246
Lincoln, made a bishop's see, 51; the Minster at, 78; see of, kept vacant, 80, 192, 212
London, councils at, 48, 50, 120, 216, 297
Longchamp, William, chancellor, bp. of Ely, 199; his character, *ib.*, 279; his administration and fall, 200

Losinga, Herbert, bp. of Thetford, 51 ; of Norwich, 79, 119
Losinga, Robert, bp. of Hereford, 38, 96
Louis VII., king of France, 174, 176, 178
Louis IX., king of France, 244
Lucius II., pope, 151
Lucy, Godfrey de, bp. of Winchester, 199, 200
Lucy, Richard de, justiciar, 157, 161, 177, 178
Luffa, Ralph, bp. of Chichester, 79
Lyons, General Council at, 240; English grievances presented to, *ib.*; speech of bp. Grosseteste at, 241, 242

Malcolm, king of Scotland, 116, 117
Malmesbury, William of, his life and writings, 316, 317
Manichean heresies, 304
Map, Walter, his character and writings, 322
Mariolatry, 310
Marriage of clergy. *See* Celibacy
Marsh, Adam, Franciscan, lectures at Oxford, 326 ; his great ability and learning, *ib.*
Martin, papal nuncio, 238 ; his arrogance, 239; forced to quit England, 240 ; complaints against, *ib.* ; saying of Henry III. on his departure, 318
Materialism, tendency to, in mediæval church, 309
Matilda, wife of William the Conqueror, 25, 27
Matilda, wife of Henry I., 116, 117, 135
Matilda, Empress, daughter of Henry I., 144, 146, 150, 151
Matilda, Countess, friend of Gregory VII., 124
Matthew Paris, his life and writings, 318
Maurice, bp. of London, 115
Melrose, first Cistercian house in Scotland, 259
Merton, Walter de, founds college at Oxford, 324
Monasteries in Normandy, 21 ; in England, 28, 36, 37, 248 ; Lanfranc's reform of, 249 ; popularity of, *ib.*, 250 ; life in, 266-270 ; usefulness of, 272 ; decline in influence of, 291, 292, 303 ; chronicles written in, 316
Murdac, Henry, abbot of Fountains, 151; elected abp. of York, *ib.*, 261; his power as abbot, 261
Murdach, Irish prince, consults Anselm, 129

Netley, abbey of, founded, 263
Neville, Ralph, bp. of Chichester and chancellor, 228 ; elected abp. of Canterbury, *ib.*; supports Stephen Langton and Hubert de Burgh, *ib.*; pope refuses to confirm election, *ib.*; great seal wrested from, 229; character of, 277
Newburgh, William of, historian, his life and writings, 317, 318
New Minster, the, at Winchester, 7
Nicholas II., pope, 25
Nicholas of Tusculum, papal legate, 217
Nigel, bp. of Ely, 147 ; seized by King Stephen, 148 ; chancellor and treasurer to Henry II., 157, 278
Nominalists, 312
Nonant, Hugh of, bp. of Lichfield, 199, 277
Norbert, St., founder of the Premonstratensian Canons, 265
Northampton, council of, 173
Norwich made a bishop's see, 51, 78

Obedientiaries, the, in monasteries, 268
Oda, abp. of Canterbury, 248
Odo, bp. of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, 4, 33, 34, 41, 61, 65, 66
Osbern, bp. of Exeter, 37, 275
Oseney, council of, 297
Osmund, bp. of Sarum, 275
Otho, Cardinal, papal legate, demands revenue of two prebends for the pope, 225 ; sent by Gregory IX. to England, 232 ; his exorbitant demands, *ib.*, 235, 236 ; his departure, 237 ; constitutions of, 298, 300
Otto IV., emperor, 213
Otto the great, emperor, 311
Oxford, John of, dean of Salisbury, opponent of Thomas Becket, 180
Oxford, Parliament of, 244 ; "Provisions" of, *ib.*

Oxford, University of, 315; its origin, 323; differences between it and University of Paris, 324; first colleges in, *ib.*; settlement of Dominicans and Franciscans in, 325

Painting, fresco, 331
Pallium or Pall, the, significance of, 284
Pandulf, papal envoy, 213; receives King John's surrender of his kingdom, 214; forbids invasion of England by king of France, 215; depreciates Stephen Langton in Rome, 217; supports Peter des Roches, 219; bp.-elect of Norwich, 222; succeeds Gualo as legate, *ib.*; resigns commission, 224
Papal legates, 13, 17, 18, 117, 135, 136, 141, 191, 217, 221, 222, 225, 232; their relation to the English Church, 285
Paris, University of, 315, 322, 324
Parish churches, 293
Paschal II, pope, 119, 120, 123, 134, 137
Passelew, Robert, nominated to see of Chichester, 235; examined by bp. Grosseteste and pronounced unfit, *ib.*
Paul, abbot of St. Albans, 22, 25, 44, 318
Penenden Heath, trial on, 34
Peter, papal legate, 136
Peter of Pomfret predicts deposition of king John, 213; cruelly executed, 215
Peter des Roches, bp. of Winchester, and justiciar, 217; attests a charter of king John, 218; urges Stephen Langton to act against John's opponents, 219; is guardian of Henry III., 224; opposed by Hubert de Burgh and abp. Stephen, *ib.*; dismissed, 225; regains influence, 229; dismissed again, 231; reinstated, *ib.*; his character, 277
Peter of Rivaulx, treasurer, 229; dismissed, 231; reinstated, 232
Peterpence, collection of, 53, 135, 240
Philip Augustus, king of France, goes on crusade, 201; invited to invade England, 213; prohibited by pope, 215
Pipewell, council at, 198
Pontigny, abbey of, Thomas Becket at, 177; Stephen Langton at, 212; Edmund Rich at, 233
Popes, their claims and demands, 2, 3, 134, 135, 225, 226, 232, 238, 240, 283-285
Popular religion, characteristics of the, 309-311
Precentor, duties of a monastic, 267
Premonstratensians or White Canons, Order of, founded, 265
Prior, duties of, 266, 267
Prymers, 311
Puiset, Hugh de, bp. of Durham, 198, 206, 207; his character, 279
Pullus or Pulleyn, Robert, teaches theology in Paris, 320

Quadrivium, the, 316
Quarr, abbey of, transferred from Order of Savigny to Citeaux, 262

Ralph d'Escures, abp. of Canterbury, 132-140
Ralph Flambard. *See* Flambard
Ralph of Wader, revolt of, 59
Reading, abbey of, 143; council at, 232
Realism, a characteristic of mediæval church, 309
Realists, 312
Reims, council at, 152
Reinhelm, bp. of Hereford, 122, 128
Remigius, almoner of Fécamp, 4; bp. of Dorchester, afterwards Lincoln, 9, 30, 31, 51, 78
Richard I., king of England, 198, 200; goes on crusade, 201; conquers Cyprus, 202; captured by Leopold of Austria, *ib.*; his dealings with Geoffrey, abp. of York, 206; his death, 208
Richard le Breton, one of the murderers of Thomas Becket, 180, 183
Richard of Dover, abp. of Canterbury, 189; his vigorous administration, 190
Richard, abp. of Canterbury, 226; resists a tax, 227; his death, 228
Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III., 237, 245

Richard, Earl Marshall, leader of Nationalists, killed, 229
Richard of Wych, bp. of Chichester, 228, 235; character of, 277
Rivaulx, Cistercian abbey, foundation of, 257, 258
Robert, duke of Normandy, 104, 115, 116; invades England, 118; defeat of, at Tinchebrai, 128
Robert, Earl of Gloucester, 144, 150
Robert of Limesey, bp. of Coventry, 50; of Chester, 119
Robert Wiscard or Guiscard, 26
Rockingham, council at, 97-101
Roger, duke of Apulia, 109
Roger, bp. of Salisbury and justiciar, 121, 128, 140, 144; seized by king Stephen, 148; dies, 150; his character, 277
Roger, earl of Hereford, revolt of, 59
Roger, chancellor, son of bp. Roger, seized by king Stephen, 148
Roger Pont l'Eveque, abp. of York, 166, 170, 171, 179, 180, 190, 191
Romsey, abbey of, 117
Roscelin, canon of Compiegne, accused of heresy, 312

Saint-worship, 310
Saladin takes Jerusalem, 201
Salisbury, foundation of cathedral at, 223
Salisbury, John of, 2, 151, 153, 181; his life and writings, 320-322
Sarum, Old, see of Sherborne shifted to, 50; see of, shifted to Salisbury and new cathedral built there, 223
Savigny, order of, founded, 262; absorbed into the Cistercian, *ib.*
Scotales, 300
Scotland, abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, 16, 46
Sculpture, 331
Sees, episcopal, removal of, 50
Sempringham, religious order founded at, 264
Sens, Thomas Becket at, 174, 178
Sheriff's aid, payment of, 163
Simeon, abbot of Ely, 46
Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester: his friendship with Robert Grosseteste, 235; on a committee of twelve for reform, 237; leader of national revolt, 244-246; killed in battle, 247
Sittingbourne, John of, elected abp. of Canterbury, 228; rejected by pope, *ib.*
Slaves, traffic in, efforts of St. Wulfstan to suppress, 40; prohibited, 121
Standard, battle of the, 147
Stephen, king of England, 2, 144; crowned, 145; his promises to the church, *ib.*; seizes bishops, 148; arraigned at Winchester, 149; taken prisoner at Lincoln, 150; quarrels with abp. Theobald, 152; dies, 154
Stephen, papal chaplain, collects subsidy for the pope, 226, 227
Stephen of Burghstede, bp. of Chichester, 245, 246
Stephen Langton. *See* Langton
Stephen de Segrave, justiciar, 229; dismissed and reinstated, 232
Stigand, abp. of Canterbury, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; deposed, 14
Stigand, bp. of Selsey, 17
Sylvester II. (Gerbert), pope, 20, 21, 312

Textus Roffensis, the, made by Ernulph, bp. of Rochester, 133
Theobald, abp. of Canterbury, 2, 146, 149, 151, 152; made papal legate, 152; his learned men, 153; supports Matilda and Henry, *ib.*; mediates between Henry and Stephen, 154; maintains order in the kingdom, *ib.*; crowns Henry II., 157; dies, 160; his character, 280
Thetford made a bishop's see, 51; see of, shifted to Norwich, 79
Thomas of Bayeux, abp. of York, 17, 29, 31, 35, 38; character of, 275
Thomas II., abp. of York, 129
Thomas, St., of Canterbury (Becket), 2, 151, 156; chancellor, 157; early history of, 158; career as chancellor, 158, 159; nominated abp. of Canterbury, 160; change in character of, 162; quarrels with Henry II. on three grounds, 163-165; at council of Clarendon, 169, 170; at

council of Northampton, 171-173; his flight to France, 174; progress of his strife with the king, 176-180; murdered, 181-183; becomes most popular saint in England, 184; translation of his relics, 223; his character, 281, 282
Thurstan, abbot of Glastonbury, his harsh treatment of the monks, 43; is deprived, 44; fined, 46
Thurstan, abp. of York, his strife with abp. of Canterbury, 136-139, 140; raises forces for the battle of the Standard, 147; assists in the foundation of Fountains Abbey, 259, 260
Tintern Abbey, foundation of, 261
Tours, John of, bp. of Wells, 72
Tracy, Walter de, one of the murderers of Thomas Becket, 180, 182
Translations of bishops, papal claims concerning, 284
Trivium, the, 316
Turold, abbot of Peterborough, 45
Twenge, Sir Robert (William Wither), heads league for expulsion of foreign clerks, 227
Twineham (Christchurch), Austin priory of, 265

Universities, rise of the, at Oxford and Cambridge, 1, 323, 324
Urban II., pope, 91, 96, 102, 104; his reception of Anselm, 108; visits Apulia, 109; dies, 113
Urse, sheriff of Worcestershire, 10

Vacarius, a teacher of law, 323
Vale Royal, abbey of, founded, 263
Valence, William, bishop-elect of, 231; Henry III. tries to force, into see of Winchester, 234
Vezelay, abbey of, Thomas Becket at, 177
Vicars, institution and maintenance of, 294, 295
Villeins, rules respecting, 169, 296
Visitations, episcopal, inquiries at, 301
Vital, St., de Mortain, founds Order of Savigny, 262
Vivian, cardinal, a papal legate, 191

Walcher, bp. of Durham, 40, 41, 276
Wales, Church in, submits to Canterbury, 143
Walkelin, bp. of Winchester, 17, 19, 36, 37, 104, 275
Walter, bp. of Hereford, 6, 19, 37
Waltham, Harold's College at, 5, 186
Waltheof, earl, 59; executed, 60
Waverley, first Cistercian house in England, 257
Westminster, councils and synods at, 9, 65, 121, 141, 146, 166, 190, 200, 225
William I. (the Conqueror), 1, 3; his devoutness, 4; his coronation, 6, 7; subjugates all England, 12, 13; meeting of, with Lanfranc, 25; ecclesiastical policy of, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, 49, 50, 51, 52; relations of, to the papacy, 51-54; dies, 64; his regard for St. Anselm, 85; his foundation of Battle Abbey, 251, 252
William II. (Rufus), 3, 64, 74; his oppression of the Church, 75-78; his first meeting with St. Anselm, 86; his illness, 87; nominates Anselm for see of Canterbury, 88; his strife with Anselm, 91-112; his death and burial, 113
William, bp. of London, 19
William of Blois, bp. of Lincoln, 212
William of St. Calais, bp. of Durham, 66, 67-71, 99, 103
William of Corbeil, abp. of Canterbury, 140-142, 145, 146
William the Lion, king of Scotland, 185, 186
William of Longchamp. *See* Longchamp
William of Warelwast, bp. of Exeter, 37, 101, 107, 111, 123, 124, 128, 135
William of Warren, founds priory of Lewes, 253
Winchester, councils and synods at, 13, 31, 48, 51, 92, 149, 191; cathedral of, built by Walkelin, 36; William Rufus buried in, 113; Richard I. crowned in, 203; John reconciled at, to Stephen Langton, 215, 216

Windsor, councils at, 17, 31, 92, 139
Witham, Carthusian priory founded at, by Henry II., 186
Worcester, cathedral of, rebuilt by St. Wulfstan, 40; consecration of a new cathedral at, 223
Worms, Concordat of, 128 note
Wulfstan, St., bp. of Worcester, 6, 16; asserts rights of his see, 17; legend concerning, 38, 39; rebuilds his cathedral, 40; suppresses slave-trade, 40; helps in suppressing revolt, 66; his death, 96; translation of his relics, 223

York, rivalry between see of, and Canterbury, 29, 31, 32, 92, 93, 136, 140; St. Mary's, abbey at, 259
Ypres, William of, 152

THE END

Printed by R. & R. Clark, Limited, *Edinburgh.*

Date Due

OCT 20 '79			

283.09
St8

Stephens, W R W
AUTHOR

The English Church from the....
TITLE

40442
BORROWER'S NAME

40442 283.09
St8

Stephens, W R W

The English Church from the Norman
Conquest to the accession of Edward I.

Lincoln Christian College & Seminary
283.09ST8 C001
THE ENGLISH CHURCH FROM THE NORMAN CONQU
3 4711 001252818